Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-244
Monday
21 December 1987

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-244 *21 December 1987*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Underground Nuclear Blast Reported 1
Zholkver Views U.S. Decision on CW Production 1
Kuntsevich Comments 1
Shishlin Notes World Efforts for INF Treaty 1
Shishlin Views Arms 'Legacy' of 1987 2
Chernyshev on 'New Thinking' in Arms Control 2
Kozyakov on U.S. Inspection Team's Visit 3
Tatarnikov Comments on European Arms Talks 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[R. Kolchanov, A. Lebedev, A. Zholkver]* 5
Gorbachev Article Provides Stimulus for UN Work 9
USSR UN Envoy Calls for Mideast Settlement 9
Gerasimov:'Good' CSSR Relations Will Continue *[AFP]* 9
EC-CEMA Colloquium Concludes Session in Ghent 10
Moscow International Ecology Conference Ends 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reagan Praises Treaty in Radio Address 12
White House, Congress Agree on Contra Aid 12
Charikov Comments on Aid 12
Zholkver on Presidential Campaign, Treaty 13
Bessmertnykh Presummit Interview on Relations *[NEW TIMES, 23 Nov]* 13
Report Cites U.S. 'Human Rights Violations' 18
PRAVDA Carries U.S. SDI Test Report *[16 Dec]* 18
Joint Fishing Expedition Sets Out 19

China

China Supports Nuclear Disarmament Policy 19
USSR, PRC Agree To Air Link of Cities 19
Moscow Gathering Marks Guangzhou Uprising 19
Beijing Scientific, Technological Meeting Held *[Dmitriyev]* 20
Competition for PRC Posts Described *[IZVESTIYA 15 Dec]* 20

Northeast Asia

Soviet-Japanese Science Commission Meets 21
Japan's Nuclear Policy 'Lacks Consistency' 22
Soviet-Japanese Trade Expert Analyzes Prospects 22
Part I *[I. Oligin]* 22
Part II *[I. Oligin]* 23
Reportage on South Korean Elections 24
Election Results Noted 24
'Unfair' Election Protested 24
Police Storm Voting Center 24
ROK Democracy Seen as Unlikely *[V. Solovyev]* 24
Rogachev, Kim Il-song Hold Talks in Pyongyang 25

Southeast Asia & Pacific

KGB Head Chebrikov To Visit SRV, Laos 25
Departure Reported 25
Hun Sen Sends Telegram to Prince Sihanouk 26
Valentinov Discusses Cambodian Settlement 26

Near East & South Asia

Akhromeyev Arrives in India 21 Dec 26
Military Operation Against Afghan Rebels Viewed 26
Soviet Transport Plane Downed *[IRNA]* 27
Direct Moscow-Kabul Cooperation Develops 27
Jordanian King Husayn's USSR Visit Previewed *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 27
Sytenko Tells Algerian Officials of INF Treaty 28
Morocco, USSR To Step Up Cultural Cooperation *[Rabat MAP]* 28
TASS Notes Israel's 'Crimes' Against Palestians 28
'Memorandum' Prompts Repression 29

East Europe

PRAVDA Profiles New CPCZ Leader Jakes *[18 Dec]* 29
Gorbachev Congratulations *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 30
Jakes Thanks Gorbachev 30
LCY Organ Ponders Operation of Press Freedom *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 31
Briefs 31
Trade With GDR 31
Trade With Romania 31

West Europe

USSR, Netherlands Agree on INF Inspections 31
France's Mitterrand Praises INF Accord 31
Norwegian Foreign Minister Briefed on Summit 32
Finland's Koivisto Meets With Aganbegyan 32
Losev Holds Bonn Talks on Cooperation 32
Spanish Communist Party Delegation Visits USSR 33
Loginov Meets With Cypriot Foreign Minister 33
Briefs 33
Telephone Accord With Spain 33

Latin America & Caribbean

Arce on U.S. Efforts To 'Stymie' Peace Plan 33
Anti-Somozist Tribunal To Try Denby 34
Salvadoran 'Guerrilla' Leader Cited on Successes 34
Komplektov Holds Brasilia Talks on Summit, Ties 34
Soviet Envoy Briefs Mexico's Sepulveda on Summit 34
Shevardnadze Receives Bolivian Ambassador 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gromyko on INF Treaty at Supreme Soviet Session 36
TASS Report on Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 19 Dec]* 36
Gorbachev, Chebrikov at State Security Celebration 37
Zaykov, Ligachev Visit Moscow Food Shops 37
Zaykov, Solovyev Attend Local Committee Plenum 37
Zaykov on INF Treaty 38
Shevardnadze Attends Moscow Ceremony 18 Dec 38

Ryzhkov Continues Visit to Alma-Ata 38
Ryzhkov Visits Mine in Dzhezkazgan 38
Slyunkov Addresses Conference on Economic Studies 39
Ligachev Attends Moscow Soiree 39
Ligachev, Talyzin Attend Teaching Aids Exhibition 39
Kim Philby Engaged in Making 5-Part TV Feature *[TRUD 19 Dec]* 40
Latvian TV Carries Series 40
Restructuring Impact on Elected Organs *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 41
Article on Zionist Anti-Soviet Campaign *[Ivanenko in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 15 Dec]* 42
Writer Warns of Dangers of 'Phantom Glasnost' *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 16 Dec]* 45
TASS Reports Earthquake in Tajikistan 49
Hurricane Hits Bering Sea Coastal Region 49

Economic

Report on Jan-Nov Industrial Performance *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 51]* 49

Scientific

Manned Spacecraft "Soyuz-TM4" Launched 21 Dec 54
Preparations Made 54
New Crew To Be Launched 54
Official Explains Preparations 55
'Dry Rocket' Tested 55
Crew Named for Launch 56
Craft Launched 21 Dec 56
'Soyuz,' 'Mir' To Link Up 56
Space Official Interviewed on 'Mir' 56
Flight of 'Progress-33' Completed 57
Balebanov Interviewed on Space Cooperation 57

Underground Nuclear Blast Reported

LD200434 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0415 GMT 20 Dec 87

["USSR Test; Underground Nuclear Explosion Carried Out in USSR; TASS announcement"—TASS headline]

[Text] [No dateline as received]—On 20 December 1987 at 0600 Moscow time at a test site in the area of Semipalatinsk in the Soviet Union, an underground nuclear explosion of up to 20 kilotons strength was carried out.

The test was carried out for the purpose of verifying the results of research in the field of nuclear explosion physics.

Zholkver Views U.S. Decision on CW Production

LD182318 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] THE WASHINGTON POST has reported that in the United States the manufacture of a new type of chemical weapon has begun—a binary type of weapon. The news commentary: Alexandr Zholkver, our political observer, is at the microphone:

[Zholkver] The report in THE WASHINGTON POST cannot fail but put us on our guard. After all, it appeared literally the week after the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. There, as the joint statement points out, both leaders expressed their adherence to banning and destroying chemical weapons. As far as our country is concerned it has already ceased their production.

Moreover, at the testing site in Shikhany the process of their destruction was demonstrated to Western, including U.S. experts. In Chapayevsk a special enterprise is being built for the elimination of chemical ammunition. What is the United States doing at the very same time? They are beginning the production of new, still more lethal types of mass-destruction weapons. Binary, or in other words dual chemical missiles, are designed for U.S. artillery, primarily for its subunits stationed in West Germany anyway, and this causes understandible anxiety and indignation for its population. The affair has reached a point that the West German trade unions addressed a protest to the FRG Constitutional Court, which ought to be examining this issue today.

However, the matter does not just concern the FRG. Forty countries that are participating in the work of the conference on disarmament consider the issue of banning chemical weapons as one of the most important and topical. Just recently another round of negotiations for working out the corresponding international convention finished in Geneva. Unfortunately, however, it is impossible not to note that recently the working out of such a convention has notably slowed down. An impression was forming that the U.S. delegation was putting the brakes on the matter. Now it is becoming clear why. Some people would have liked to leave outside the ban the binary types of chemical weapons that the United States has begun to produce. How, after all this, can yesterday's Voice of America commentary be interpreted, in which the official point of view of the U.S. Government is expressed in favor of banning chemical weapons. The production of new chemical ammunition does not tie in with this.

It is only left to hope that in Washington they will nevertheless remember that during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting the necessity for an all-embracing and effective ban and elimination of chemical weapons was confirmed.

Kuntsevich Comments

LD190953 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—The launching of the production of binary munitions in the United States raises the combat potential of the U.S. chemical troops to a fundamentally new level, Lieutenant-General Anatoliy Kuntsevich, deputy head of the chemical troops of the USSR Defence Ministry, told a TASS diplomatic correspondent.

The binary munitions are a first-strike weapon which will allow the United States to bring its combat chemical potential closer to the European and other theoretical theatres of military operations and, by the way, to do it covertly. This possibility arises in view of the separate delivery of non-toxic components of binary chemical munitions to the site of their future use.

The appearance of the binary munitions complicates control over chemical weapons and, actually, brings to naught the possibility of this control, General Kuntsevich said furthermore. This circumstance will decisively affect the course of the negotiations in Geneva on elaborating a convention banning chemical weaponry. With the appearance of binary munitions, it will be actually impossible to include verification measures in this convention. As a result, the new U.S. chemical weapon can become the key hurdle in the way towards signing this document.

The launching of the production of binary munitions at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, shows that the United States has embarked on the course of scuttling the convention on banning chemical weapons, General Kuntsevich said.

Shishlin Notes World Efforts for INF Treaty

LD192023 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] At a news conference held today in Delhi, Romesh Chandra, president of the World Peace Council, declared that the signing in Washington of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles was an outstanding victory for the peace-loving public and antiwar forces of the whole planet. A latest news commentary: At the microphone is Political Observer Nikolay Shishlin:

[Shishlin] I would like to draw your attention to the fact that if in Washington there were two main dramatis personae, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States, that does not mean that the rest of the world and the world community were no more than mere dumb spectators of that historic meeting. In reality, the Washington meeting as such was played out against a very active political backdrop; it is very symptomatic that immediately after the end of the talks with President Reagan, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev went to Berlin, where he met with his friends and allies who had made a considerable contribution both to the elaboration of positions and to the efforts made by the Socialist community to improve international relations. In speaking of the active role of the Socialist community, I do not wish to belittle the quite noticeable and clearly expressed position adopted by many of the countries of West Europe. We have already noted Bonn's contribution to resolving one of the rather complex questions involved in drawing up the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, namely that of eliminating the Pershing-1A's sited in West Germany.

I think that in touching on this political background against which the Washington meeting took place, we should not lose sight of the active position of the non-aligned states, the active role of the six well-known countries which have repeatedly put forward a variety of initiatives and expressed solidarity with our country's vigorous actions in favor of evening out international relations. Without a doubt, the international public made itself heard in the success of the Washington meeting. So when one speaks now of the future destiny of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles and of the intentions which are clearly delineated by the Soviet-U.S. declaration, and about the fate of those intentions, we must take into account not only the Soviet Union's political will, not only the rather motley political situation in the United States, but we must also understand, and be clear about, the fact that a very prominent and active part in the future development of the international situation will belong to Europe, Japan, and the Third World, and of course to our socialist friends and allies.

Shishlin Views Arms 'Legacy' of 1987

LD201238 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0348 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. summit that took place on the eve of the new year has revived hopes for a better future. This is what Political Observer Nikolay Shishlin says in his comment.

[Shishlin] The year 1987 is certainly not leaving a bad legacy to the year 1988. One presumes that the year 1988 will be marked by a considerable activization of our mutual links, our interaction, and our cooperation with socialist friends and allies and, hopefully, new progress in relations with our great neighbors—the People's Republic of China.

Undoubtedly, the year 1988 will be marked by the activization and expansion of our country's dialogue with our West European partners. Yet apparently it would not be an exaggeration to say that future events within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. dailogue, which has received a new impetus from the Washington summit, will have a crucial importance. Most different issues will be within the scope of view yet the main efforts will be focused on finding a mutually acceptable compromise regarding a deep 50% cut in strategic offensive weapons and the strengthening of the ABM Treaty regime.

I think that what has already been done in 1987, namely, the consent to cut strategic offensive weapons by 50%, the finding of a nearly visible solution on the sublevels of strategic arms, and the clear understanding of the fact that it would be difficult to find a compromise on reducing strategic offensive weapons outside the strengthening of the ABM Treaty regime constitute not a bad basis for the forthcoming difficult, complex, but vitally important talks on the preparation of the political foundation without which a new full-scale Soviet-U.S. summit would be unthinkable.

So, even if 1987 has not yielded a radical breakthrough in Soviet-U.S. relations, it has clearly outlined the prospect for a turn in the development of international relations, which may become reality in the coming 1988 year. I believe that the political advance and the political capital that has been accumulated as a result of actions by our country, other peace-loving states, and the international public in the expiring year, can and must be augmented in 1988.

Chernyshev on 'New Thinking' in Arms Control

LD182054 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1346 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 18 Dec TASS—Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS observer on military matters, writes:

The treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles signed in Washington is, in essence, the first practical embodiment of new thinking in the military sphere. A psychological barrier that very recently seemed unattainable has been surmounted, and the first step on the path of real destruction of nuclear arsenals has been taken.

Some people in the West are trying to find out who won in the conclusion of this treaty and who made concessions to whom. But, in the first place, the treaty is the result of mutual concessions and, in the second place, both sides and common sense won, because the treaty is an important contribution toward strengthening stability and increasing the security of both the United States and the USSR.

The military-strategic balance, which guarantees mutual security, possesses in present conditions a significant dynamic range, thanks to which differences in the sides' nuclear arsenals are being leveled out to a significant degree. Strategic parity is primarily the ability of both the United States and the USSR to inflict unacceptable damage on each other. That means that it is possible to have regional imbalances without security suffering as a result. In order to maintain the balance, there is absolutely no obligation to seek "mirror" equality or to duplicate the nuclear potential of the other side.

A reflection of new thinking in the military sphere is the fact that the USSR deemed it possible to not take account of the nuclear forces of Britain and France in the regional European balance, "singled out" medium-range missiles from the Reykjavik package and then added shorter-range missiles to them as well, and is reducing roughly two times more missiles and warheads under the treaty. Our country's defense capability is in no way reduced: Its military potential consists not only of a certain quantity of medium- and shorter-range missiles, but includes other important means of ensuring its defense capability reliably—strategic forces, tactical nuclear arms, and conventional arms and forces. The main thing remains the impossibility for either of the sides to resort to nuclear arms to achieve political goals.

The principle of asymmetry in reductions used in the treaty is extremely important for subsequent steps in the field of disarmament. Obviously, it must become universal and be used in accordance with objective necessity to carry out more sizable reductions in certain classes of arms of first the one side and then the other.

For example, there are around 15,000 nuclear weapons on the launch vehicles of the U.S. strategic offensive forces according to existing assessments, and around 10,000 on the Soviet Union's. It has already been stipulated at the highest level that, as a result of a 50% reduction, each side will have to have no more than 6,000 weapons of this type. Consequently, one can assume that with the conclusion of an agreement on 50% reductions, the sides will change places, as it were: Now the USSR is destroying 2,500 medium- and shorter-range missile warheads and the United States 1,320, but in the field of strategic forces the USSR will cut approximately 4,000 weapons and the United States about 9,000.

It appears that the principle of an asymmetrical reduction may be applied to the benefit of both sides at the talks on conventional armaments and armed forces also. The Soviet leadership has firmly stated that in this sphere, too, the party having more of certain armaments should also reduce them to a correspondingly greater degree. But in this the approach should be bilateral and just. At present, for example, official representatives of NATO are seeking to operate using separate, partial indices, while keeping silent about those areas where NATO's superiority is confirmed even by its own official data. Take, for example, tactical strike aviation. According to the Pentagon brochure "Soviet Military Power," the ratio is 1.5:1 in NATO's favor; the Warsaw Pact has 2,300 while NATO has 3,450 fighter bombers and ground-attack aircraft. If the greater number of tanks of the Warsaw Pact arouses the concern of the West Europeans, then NATO's superiority in offensive weapons such as strike aircraft should arouse no less concern in our country.

Now the Soviet Union has shown a good example of new thinking in the military sphere. The experience accumulated in elaborating the treaty on medium and shorter-range missiles and the precedents created by its tenets should facilitate joint progress along the path toward a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. But this progress will become possible only with the observation of the principle of equality and equal security.

Kozyakov on U.S. Inspection Team's Visit

LD190215 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] A group of American experts are expected in this country to examine the Pawn Shop wheeled radar station and separate units of the Flat Twin radar station near Moscow and Gomel. More in commentary by Vladislav Kozyakov:

Shortly before the Soviet-American summit, he writes, the White House issued a report saying that near Moscow and Gomel there appeared radar stations that had formerly been located at the testing site at Sary Shagan. This fact was described as another violation by the Soviet Union of the ABM Treaty. In this connection, the Soviet Union said that the United States mistook ordinary vans and containers, equipped with no radar devices, for mobile radar stations. The Soviet Foreign Ministry also expressed the readiness to show American representatives the above-mentioned objects.

For some reason, the offer was not accepted immediately in order to make sure, before the summit, that the accusations were groundless. But now, 2 weeks after the summit, the Americans will be able not only to examine the objects under question but also to take photographs. If Americans have any concerns about verification problems they are welcome to come and see for themselves. Such an approach is becoming exceedingly popular here. American experts were invited some time ago to the Soviet nuclear testing site at Semipalatinsk where they mounted measuring instruments. Today there is also an agreement for mutual inspections at the test sites in Nevada and near Semipalatinsk.

Representatives of America and other countries have visited the Soviet chemical weapons base at Shikhany, and later on Soviet experts visited a similar base at Tooele, Utah. But the best example of Soviet-American cooperation in mutual inspections and verification is, of

course, the Washington signed treaty scrapping intermediate and short-range missiles. This document provides for dozens of on-site inspections and strict permanent control. But even today one can feel the inertia of the past in the complex problems of control.

The wish for openness must be mutual, but it's not always this way. For instance, to remove the problems raised by the United States with regard to the Krasnoyarsk radar station, American congressmen were invited to make an inspection and take photographs. Moreover, this country has unilaterally introduced a 1-year moratorium on all work at the Krasnoyarsk station. But I haven't heard of any similar steps taken with regard to the American radar station in Scotland that is a source of concern on the part of the Soviet Union.

Tatarnikov Comments on European Arms Talks
LD202152 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Text] Negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe are scheduled to begin in Vienna next year. However, the sides have so far been unable to reach an agreement regarding a mandate for these negotiations, specifically on whether to include in the mandate the issue of reducing nuclear battlefield weapons at the same time as conventional arms.

Major-General Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation, speaks about the position of our country:

[Tatarnikov] If the issue regarding medium- and shorter-range missiles has practically been solved now, then in Europe many so-called tactical nuclear weapons or battlefield weapons remain. The thing is that these weapons, in other words, tactical missiles, tactical strike aviation and artillery, are capable of employing both conventional and nuclear munitions, and the number of these weapons is increasing every year, especially in the NATO countries. Now, at the Vienna negotiations we are talking about the fact that because these weapons form a part of the structure of conventional weapons, let us examine them together. Moreover, you are saying that these are conventional arms. The majority of NATO countries agree with this, and they are prepared to examine them. However, we are saying: Let us write it down in the mandate, which we are now drafting for future negotiations. But the NATO countries are saying: No, let us not include it in the mandate. But we cannot allow this to happen. A serious document is being worked out; it is the passport for future negotiations, and in this passport the whole program which will be embraced by the negotiations must be registered.

Besides, if we speak from a purely practical point of view, then imagine this situation: Let us assume that we are reducing divisions, withdrawing them from Europe, and leaving on-site missile battalions, nuclear artillery—in other words, we are not touching them.

How will the other side look at it? They are not ready for this. They are saying: Withdraw these dual purpose systems also. We are saying it is only natural. But we must include it in the negotiations mandate. This very problem is now becoming one of the main ones. This problem concerns the topic of the negotiations, basically what systems will be embraced by the negotiations. As far as this is concerned, the position of the Warsaw Pact states is very clear. We are advocating that both conventional weapons and nuclear weapons be examined and eliminated so that in Europe such a level of these weapons is left which is necessary only for defense, and so that this level is kept within the bounds of reasonable adequacy. A position like this is just and I believe that it will triumph.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'
LD202129 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 20 Dec 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor-in-chief of the newspaper TRUD; Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, international affairs journalist; and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, political observer of Moscow Television and All-Union Radio]

[Text] [Zholkver] Hello, Comrades. A week has passed since the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Six thousand journalists have filed their newspaper articles and radio and television reports on this event from Washington. Now we can sit back and take stock of what has taken place, analyze what we've seen and heard, and ponder the future. I know, Rudolf Georgiyevich, that you were one of those 6,000 journalists lucky enough to find yourselves at the epicenter of the event in Washington while the meeting was going on. So now, a week later, what are the impressions that strike you as the most significant and lasting?

[Kolchanov] Of course, I could call to mind a great many things that I experienced during those days in Washington, as could, I think, those thousands of journalists you've just mentioned. Naturally, what made the biggest impression was the actual signing of the treaty. One also remembers every move and every gesture of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America and their exchange of pens.

[Zholkver] The pens with which they signed the document.

[Kolchanov] Yes, and one can see that exchange as symbolizing the special strengthening of the signatures—that's one way of looking at it. I think, speaking of symbols, that the "bridge of peace" that I believe was shown on television here was very important.

[Lebedev] The chain.

[Kolchanov] The chain, yes, yes, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich. There were two interesting...

[Lebedev] From our embassy...

[Kolchanov] ...To the White House, quite right. You'll have seen the presentation and acceptance of that big bouquet of roses. You also saw, no doubt, the opposite end of the chain, when the White House guard threw the bouquet of roses into the trash can.

[Zholkver] Incidentally, at the same time a peace chain linked the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow with the U.S. Embassy.

[Kolchanov] Yes, we heard that and I even saw it. We were able to get it on channel 14.

[Lebedev] The Soviet television transmission.

[Kolchanov] On Soviet television, yes. Our colleagues here in Moscow did a very good job, and we saw their work from a distance of many thousands of miles. Well, to get back to the peace chain and the incident when the White House guard tossed the roses into the trash can, you know, if he had done it in anger, as it were, I would not have been surprised, because there have been and are both opponents and adherents of detente. But to do it with such unconcern, such indifference—that jarred on me particularly, because indifference and unconcern are so out of keeping with our nuclear age, so unseemly. The times we live in demand that we should take a definite stand; fortunately there is less and less apathy, as the events in Washington and the reaction of the world public have shown.

Then there was another very minor episode: After the official ceremony was over, Mikhail Sergeyevich and President Reagan went to the Oval Office for the photographs—part of the usual protocol. They let us in in 3 batches of 20 to 25 people each, literally just for 1 and 1/2 to 2 minutes. Well, the Americans in their hospitable way included their own journalists in the first batch and us, less hospitably, in the second. Well, and then when a minute and 1/2 or 2 minutes later the Americans came out, we went in and our photojournalists, who had waited a long time for that moment, quickly started taking pictures. When they were told, "Come on, time's up" they were all taken aback and stood there in consternation. Then suddenly Mikhail Sergeyevich said: "But comrades, you've had 30 seconds longer than the others anyway" and smiled. That was so human and so direct that it immediately put everyone in a better mood.

[Zholkver] You know it has to be said bluntly that what happened in Washington seems to some people even now incredible, a fantasy. After all, there had been such difficulties in the way of the Washington meeting and the signing of the missile treaty, and there have been, and still are quite a few problems in our relations with the Americans. How did we nonetheless manage to overcome so many obstacles? What made success possible? Some say it was due to the policy of acting from positions of strength: That NATO continued to rely on strength, and got what it wanted. What do my colleagues think about this?

[Kolchanov] One demonstrator I talked to, a retired worker from Detroit and a Vietnam veteran, told me in so many words: "We brought you to the conference table. Strength is the only thing the Russians understand." I had to take issue with him and there a lot of things I had to explain to him; but I think there were quite a number of factors that made those negotiations possible. It really has been very difficult, if you remember for example that in 1983—not long ago at all—Reagan was declaring that the Soviet union was an evil empire.

[Zholkver] Yes, of course he still sees us an evil empire, but signs treaties with us. Why?

[Lebedev] You know, my opinion is that it is the new political thinking that our leadership has proclaimed and, above all, has not just proclaimed but also been struggling for with the utmost vigor and consistency, undeterred by the objective difficulties and in spite of the setbacks that may have occurred in the course of this very difficult undertaking, not becoming discouraged, but continuing this persistent struggle to implement new approaches and a new way of thinking in world politics. Well, let us recall specifically what the main stages were that led up to this, because, indeed, the time that has elapsed has been quite short. In 1985, there was the Geneva meeting between President Reagan and the general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. That was the first meeting. It was very difficult, yet already things were moving.

[Zholkver] Yes, inasmuch as it was emphasized in Geneva that nuclear war must not be allowed to happen, that no one could win it, and that war must not exist at all in our nuclear age. It is not for nothing, by the way, that this was later reaffirmed in Washington in a joint declaration.

[Kolchanov] Yes, special stress was laid on that.

[Zholkver] This was a very great success in advancing these ideas of the new political thinking in real policy, in real international relations. A year passed, then came the very difficult meeting in Reykjavik, which promised a radical change. It didn't happen. We needn't go into detail about all the reasons and so on. Listeners will remember that the Soviet Union approached the meeting with a very constructive and very radical program that would have opened up the prospect of disarmament. That was when we, for the first time, proposed a 50% reduction of strategic offensive armaments.

[Lebedev] Quite right.

[Kolchanov] In many areas we met halfway the positions of the United States and of the West as a whole, but their stubbornness and adherence to "Star Wars" wrecked the accord. All the same, Reykjavik did achieve a great deal. It was the next step in implementing our program. The fact that we didn't give in--if one can put it like that—to U.S. stubborness is further proof, as it were, that in dealing with us force is not the answer, and that what's happening now is in no way an indication of weakness on our part, but evidence of the new political thinking. Of course, we have to remember all the time 15 January 1986, the date when the Soviet Union put forward its program for nuclear disarmament before the end of the century. That is the highly important event marking the beginning of implementation of that program; and in effect, we are now present at the beginning of the actual realization of that plan in practical terms.

[Zholkver] Another thing I think we should note is that one of the very important factors responsible for the success in Washington—a success many people had not predicted and regarded as inconceivable—has been the activity of the whole socialist community in vigorously supporting our course towards eliminating nuclear weapons and our concrete proposals for reducing conventional and nuclear arms. I had the good fortune to be in Berlin in the days after the Washington meeting. There was a meeting in Berlin of the leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries, and I remember that in those few minutes remaining after the Berlin meeting before Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev left for Moscow, at a reception in the Council of State, our hospitable host Comrade Erich Honecker said this: "Peace and disarmament: that is our credo. Six months ago our allied socialist states expressed here in Berlin their determination that a world without nuclear weapons should become a reality, that not one type of weapon should be left out of the process of disarmament, and that all this should take place in a situation of comprehensive control and verification. We want to go on as we have begun, and we shall be steadfast in adhering to that aim."

I must say that a great many people now think that way in the socialist countries. In Berlin I had a lot of meetings and conversations and interviews with Berliners—and incidentally also with guests of the GDR, people from the other socialist countries—and they were emphatic that this was the common, joint success of our socialist community. Of course, they thought very highly of what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev did in Washington, and fully supported the treaty signed there. In Berlin, an agreement was also signed between the Soviet Union, the GDR and Czechoslovakia on inspections in connection with the Washington treaty on the two classes of nuclear missiles. So it is our common success.

[Kolchanov] If we're talking about the things that led to the talks, I'd like to add this: There's been a noticeable change in world public opinion in favor of disarmament. That has been very noticeable, even in the private conversations I had in Washington—and it's very noticeable in the press, too, and in the expressions by the masses of the working people and the massive demonstrations of world public opinion, that has been giving increasingly firm indications to the parliaments, the politicians and governments. Those indications have been pointing unequivocally in the direction of disarmament and detente, toward a search for compromises. At the end of the day, we have covered our part of the distance, and the Americans have done likewise. We have made compromises and so have they. The important thing is that these compromises have taken account equally of one's own security and of that of the other side. They have not threatened the security of the negotiating partners. These have been equivalent moves; and they have led to talks that have given equal value and equal rights to both sides.

[Lebedev] I agree with you, Rudolf Georgiyevich, and I'd just like to remind you of those who certainly deserve for

their efforts to also be remembered today, namely that considerable segment of public opinion that represents, as it were, the antiwar groups and movements of various shades. I include everyone, from the women who blockaded the U.S. missile base in Britain by pitching their camp at Greenham Common to the scientists advocating nuclear disarmament, and the physicians and so on. They have played an enormous role in shaping public opinion that you have been talking about. This has been their victory, achieved by great efforts; and without a doubt it has been thanks to their pressure and their insistent persuation. Let us recall the Moscow forum, where, as we've been saying so frequently today, the new political thinking came to the fore very vividly and at full strength, and where the representatives of the Western public, of the influential political parties, expressed certain ideas to which our leadership was very attentive. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has referred to this repeatedly.

[Kolchanov] Yes, in quite a number of instances public opinion has been ahead of the politicians, ahead of the statesmen, and has at times, if you like, given them a nudge. Well, naturally what everyone's interested in now is not only, and perhaps not so much, the past, but rather the future. What will happen now, what can we expect after the Washington meeting? Well, a great many people of course—and this is quite obvious from our listeners' letters—are worried about whether the treaty signed in Washington will be ratified. I'm aware that this is no idle question. I myself witnessed the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty in Vienna in 1979, which was never ratified and was never even submitted to the U.S. Senate.

[Zholkver] Rudolf Georgiyevich, what do the Americans say and think about this question?

[Kolchanov] Well, they're talking and thinking a lot about it; and if one were to summarize it all, one thing that certainly can be said is that there will be difficulties, undoubtedly there will be. If we take the individual opinions of people of authority and standing, they are even doing arithmetic. In Washington I met the U.S. ambassador in Moscow, Mr. Matlock. He also thinks there will be difficulties over ratification, but he's beginning to add up how many in the Senate are for and how many against. Senator Cranston has also counted: About 50 actually in favor and 20 or 22 actually against. They need 67, so the hopes lie somewhere about the middle. Well, the one thing that's certain is that there will be difficulties. By no means is everyone in the United States in agreement with the content of the treaty. All the same, though, as far as the predominant opinion is concerned, all have greater hopes that the treaty will be ratified.

[Zholkver] I must say that the feelings you are talking about, the feelings of the man in the street, as the saying goes—and I have recently seen an enormous number of opinion polls that are being carried out in the United States and, by the way, in our country too such opinion polls are being carried out—and this...

[Lebedev interrupts] Including joint opinion polls with the Americans.

[Zholkver] Yes, and this, of course, is reflected in the actions of politicians. Thus, literally this week, Dole, the Republican leader in the Senate, has for the first time spoken definitely in favor of the agreement, though before his position was very ambivalent...

[Lebedev interrupts] Sceptical position.

[Kolchanov] Yes, this is a sign of the times, so to speak; if you wish, this is evidence of the changes that are underway in the United States. But, speaking about those feelings, I would not want to conceal that we are receiving quite a few letters from our listeners expressing concern over whether, as a result of the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, our country's security may be damaged.

[Lebedev] On the whole, the question is understandable. In this connection, one would like to point out that the coming into force of the agreement depends not only on its ratification by the Senate but also on its ratification by the USSR Supreme Soviet. On the whole, this is a bilateral process; and from this point of view, our people's question requires explanations. I, for example, believe that very serious discussions of the text of the agreement will take place both in the Commissions for Foreign Affairs of the Supreme Soviet and at the public level, because everybody asks: how can Soviet security benefit by it if we are eliminating a considerably greater number of nuclear warheads and missiles than the United States is? Yet, one should look at this in a specific manner, take a look,. so to speak, from the standpoint of the very same new political thinking at the general alignment of forces and not at the military balance alone...

[Kolchanov interrupts] But also at the balance of interests and the balance of security, which are determined not by arithmetic alone.

[Lebedev] Absolutely true. Yes, and we support the position set forth by the late Olof Palme and his commission to the effect that in today's world security—you are right, Rudolf Georgiyevich—can only be common and general, it cannot be the security of one against another. Yes, we are eliminating more missiles and nuclear warheads but one has to bear in mind that the U.S. side and NATO are liquidating nuclear arms that are capable of reaching our territory, simply put, in 8 to 10 minutes—high-precision missiles and those with a great capacity for penetrating the air defense system, that is cruise missiles. These are weapons which are, so to speak, at our door. This is, of course, a colossal gain for our security. This is undoubtedly an enormous gain for

Western Europe and the European and the Euroepan socialist countries. Concerning medium- and shorter-range missiles—and incidentally, conventional arms and armed forces and also strategic ones—taking into account the asymetry in this aspect too between us and the United States the time has come when this situation cannot be regarded purely arithmetically. It is not a case of a warhead for a warhead. The general package of issues has to be taken into account here, with priority given to a political gain, and the political gain means that the world either becomes safer and close to a nuclear-free future or not.

There is another, just as important aspect. Some of our compatriots ask this question as well: Why did we need to have so many of those warheads and those missiles that we have now to reduce them? Was it necessary to strive for that? I wish to recall here—and the West acknowledges this—that in fact they deployed their medium-range missiles not in response to our SS-20—by the way, when I was reading the agreement and an article in PRAVDA the other day I was happy to see that we have, at last switched to our own terminology, "RSD-10" instead of "SS-20" which was invented for us overseas and in NATO—they deployed them not in response to our deployment but to provide a nuclear link between West Europe and the United States. This is how it was, in fact, because the production of Pershing-2's started around the end of the seventies when the SS-20's were not yet being deployed. It is certainly clear that they were not being produced for deployment on U.S. territory. What for? to aim them at Mexico and Canada?

[Kolchanov] Senselessly, in my view.

[Lebedev] Those weapons were clearly destined for Europe. I can put the question in the following manner: If we had not had—this is my personal view—that certain superiority in warheads that we have today, then, maybe concluding the agreement would have been more difficult because, in persuading some of their West European partners—sincerely or maybe feigning in certain respects here—the Americans are pointing precisely to the fact that the Soviets have to eliminate a greater number of warheads. On the whole, it hardly makes sense to delve into this story now. One now has to evaluate the situation as it is. And the change—though it involves eliminating as little as 3 to 4% of the nuclear arsenals—is huge in its political significance.

[Zholkver] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, You also mentioned an important issue for the future: the next stage, which is reducing strategic offensive weapons. It is to be on a substantially larger scale, by 50%, but certainly, this is possible only on condition that the ABM Treaty is preserved in full. Well, I saw reports both immediately following the Washington meeting and later alleging that during the Washington talks, differences on the SDI were removed, I mean the U.S. Star Wars program. What could you say about this, Rudolf Georgiyevich?

[Kolchanov] First of all, I must say that the SDI as such was not the subject of the talks. Of course, certain aspects of it were touched upon, but it did not form a separate topic of the talks. Secondly, the idea of the SDI is becoming ever more blurred. Little is left on the whole, in military and scientific circles, of the SDI that the U.S. President imagined originally; or to be more precise, an opinion has formed that the SDI seen as an all-covering umbrella in space is simply not feasible. But whatever the question, whatever U.S. experts, military or political, say our position in this case is very clear—we are against militarizing space in any form, and here we are not making any concessions. It has been stressed that talks on the 50% reduction of strategic offensive weapons are possible if the ABM treaty is observed in the existing form over a timespan to be determined in future talks.

[Zholkver] That is, no party is to pull out of the treaty within that period of time.

[Kolchanov] Exactly, no pulling out of the treaty.

[Lebedev] Most of the leaders of the Western NATO countries agree with the 50% reduction, let alone neutral countries. Even now one can already discern an attempt to link various other matters to this issue. They have again started connecting it with Afghanistan, for example, but there are also military matters to be considered. In particular, I am judging by the press, which has just been covering the trip of Secretary of State Shultz to a number of countries in Western Europe. In my view, attempts are being made to change priorities somehow. In other words, there has been a suggestion that the question of a 50% reduction immediately entails the question of a triple-zero option. After all, we have attained the double-zero—the destruction of two classes of nuclear missiles. But there remains "the triple-zero" in Europe. This concerns, above all, short-range missiles, whose range is up to 500 km. There are an enormous number of these. The U.S. side still has, I think, about 4,500 plus nuclear wearheads for artillery.

[Kolchanov] Yes those too.

[Lebedev] And bombs, of course. They still exist on bombers, and so on. Besides, of course, we have to consider the British and French nuclear systems. For, the British and French are acting very modest. They keep saying that they have got so little in the way of nuclear weapons that it is not their turn yet, so to speak. However, one must also be realistic. Their turn must come pretty soon, particularly if the 50% reduction is enforced, because in the meantime they are building up their nuclear systems. Proportions will therefore be changing very sharply. According to the figures that I have seen, sometime in the neneties the joint nuclear arsenals of Britain and France will equal one-third of the Soviet arsenal. Then, if you also add to this the U.S. arsenal... So, all these issues will have to be tackled.

[Zhalkov] I think, if one tries to sum up our conversation today, one cannot fail to note enormous changes in the world. The new political thinking is making its way. Of course, all this is not simple. It is necessary to take care of this sprout that has come up through the concrete of prejudices and stereotypes, and to preserve it. World public opinion is appealing for this as well as the peace supporters and politicians. But you know, I think that all this is connected with another factor. I wish to return to what has actually determined the success of the talks in Washington. I have in mind our internal affairs, that is, restructuring in our country. It is not fortuitous that it has drawn such very great attention during the days of the Washington meeting. I have just received some U.S. magazines. Both TIME and NEWSWEEK are literally crowded with material on our restructuring.

[Lebedev] What in DER SPIEGEL...

[Zholkov interrupts] I think that it is quite symbolic that the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee considered many issues concerning our home policies and the economic and social development of Soviet society at the very meeting at which it considered the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington. The better our home situation is, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, the more active and more successful will be our foreign policy, too.

Colleagues, let me thank you for your participation in this program. Thank you, listeners, for your attention.

Gorbachev Article Provides Stimulus for UN Work
LD210658 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 21 TASS—The United Nations General Assembly today ends its 42nd session which has been marked by an increased desire by the international community to look for ways of solving the pressing problems of the nuclear and space age.

An article by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, headlined "Realities and Guarantees of a Secure World", has provided an important stimulus for work at the session to proceed in a spirit of new thinking.

The article won high praise from delegates seeing it [as] an invitation for the United Nations and its members and also for the international public at large to conduct productive exchanges of opinions in the name of creating a safe and nuclear-free world.

A resolution on a comprehensive system of international peace and security has become the most important decision of the 42nd session. It details a concept for comprehensive security to be ensured by peaceful political means, on an equal basis for all and in all spheres of international relations with strict compliance with the U.N. Charter.

The General Assembly has hailed the signature of a historic treaty eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and expressed the hope for further-reaching agreements on disarmament to follow.

USSR UN Envoy Calls for Mideast Settlement
LD191330 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0645 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] New York, 19 Dec (TASS)—TASS Correspondent Sergey Baybakov reports: The implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to an independent and sovereign state, is an essential condition for firm peace in the Near East. This was stated on Friday at a meeting of the UN Security Council by those participating in the discussion of the question of the situation in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories whose population is subjected to brutal terror by the aggressors.

A.M. Belonogov, permanent representative of the USSR at the United Nations, stated that there is now an objective opportunity to break the course of events in the Near East. The main thing in the present conditions, he pointed out, is to make a start on practical movement toward an overall settlement that should envisage the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories, the implementation by the people of Palestine of their inalienable national rights to self-determination and the creation of their own independent state, and ensuring the right of all states of the region to a secure and independent existence and development.

Hoping that the Security Council will give a worthy assessment of Israel's illegal activities on the West Bank of the Jordan and in the Gaza Strip, and will take the necessary steps in this connection, the USSR once again calls on all states to make their contribution to the resolution of the conflict situation in the Near East and states its readiness to cooperate with everyone who really wants a Near Eastern settlement on a just and firm basis, taking account of the interests and rights of all the states and peoples of this region, the representative of the USSR said. [passage omitted]

Gerasimov:'Good' CSSR Relations Will Continue
AU171611 Paris AFP in English 1605 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Anne Penketh report]

[Excerpt] Moscow, Dec 17 (AFP)—Soviet-Czechoslovak relations "are good, and will stay that way" following the replacement of Gustav Husak at the head of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told AFP Thursday.

Asked to what extent Moscow had been kept informed of Mr. Husak's planned departure from the party leadership before Thursday's official announcement, Mr. Gerasimov said: "We know a lot about it. It was a process which was discussed".

Mr. Gerasimov did not say whether the discussion of the departure of the party leader, the first Eastern bloc party chief to leave office since Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev came to power in March 1985, reflected the Soviet policy of openness being extended to include relations with Soviet allies.

Mr. Gorbachev sent a telegram congratulating Mr. Husak's successor to the party leadership, Milos Jakes, TASS news agency said.

The Soviet leader expressed confidence that the Czechoslovak leadership would "ensure the fulfilment of wide-scale tasks facing the party" in the field of "development and renewal of Socialism" in Czechoslovakia, economic restructuring, and "democratisation" of public and political life.

Mr. Gorbachev's telegram focused on key issues currently also the focus of attention in the Soviet Union, analysts noted.

Mr. Gerasimov would not speculate on whether Mr. Husak's replacement would be a more enthusiastic supporter of the economic and social reforms known as perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

"They have their own process there," he said.

However, he noted that Mr. Jakes and Mr. Gorbachev "know each other", and indicated that the two would have met during Mr. Gorbachev's visit to Czechoslovakia last April, although the Soviet leader at that time "met everyone" in the Czechoslovak leadership.

Western diplomats said that Mr. Jakes had held talks in Moscow with Mr. Gorbachev in October last year. [passage omitted]

EC-CEMA Colloquium Concludes Session in Ghent

LD200722 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1215 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Excerpts] Brussels, 19 December (TASS)—TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

An international colloquium on the subject of the "The Political and Legal Framework of Trade Relations Between the EC and Socialist Countries" has ended in the Belgian city of Ghent. Organized by a local university, it brought together around 230 participants, representatives of the leadership of EC and CEMA countries and the leading bodies of the two groups, as well as business circles from the United States and Japan.

Several thematic sessions took place as part of the meeting, devoted to the concrete conditions of trade relations between EC and CEMA countries and of the positions of Western European firms in their trade with CEMA countries, and to new opportunities opening up in socialist countries for trade with Western Europe, particularly in connection with the restructuring begun in the USSR.

Among the speakers were Professor Ivan Ivanov, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission under the USSR Council of Ministers, and Professor Aleksandr Bykov of the Economics of the World Socialist System institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who discussed restructuring in the USSR's foreign economic ties. they also discussed new opportunities that have opened up for developing mutually advantageous trade between East and West.

In his report CEMA Secretary Vyacheslav Sychev stressed that "at the moment in Europe, exceptionally favorable conditions are taking shape for expanding business cooperation between states with different social orders, and the 1980's may become a turning point in their mutual relations." He says all necessary prerequisites for this exist, including "understanding the importance of interaction between CEMA and EEC countries for all-European cooperation and normalization of the European political situation, as well as for the expansion and deepening of the all-European process, which was started in Helsinki in 1975. This understanding is manifested in the common aspiration of the EEC and CEMA to establish official relations. There is a mutual economic interest in trade."

Great interest was also aroused by the addresses of the delegates from the CSSR, Hungary, Romania, Poland, the GDR, and Bulgaria. Their reports stressed that in the area of international economic relations, mutually advantageous cooperation between all countries is required, and any acts of discrimination and economic diktat, boycott and trading, credit and technological blockade should be excluded from practical international dealings. In addition, the principles of respect for national independence and sovereignty, noninterference, full equality of rights, respect for national interests, mutual advantage, and the principle of maximum benefit must be observed. [passage omitted]

The colloquium was the third such meeting this year. [passage omitted]

The atmosphere at all three meetings was very amicable. The fact that three highly representative international forums on practical questions of developing relations between Eastern and Western Europe have been held in a year shows that the problems discussed there are highly topical.

Moscow International Ecology Conference Ends
LD181655 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Stanislav Vargulevich:

An international ecological conference for promoting environmental education, which ended in Moscow today, called for preserving peace on earth and ensuring man's basic right—the right to live.

The conference was attended by representatives of the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Syria, India, France, West Germany and Sweden. They pointed out that preserving world peace was an important but not the only pre-condition for mankind's survival in the third millennium.

The ecologists stressed the need for a sensible attitude to the environment and said that contemporary science should handle objective environmental problems and spell them out to every man. Knowledge and efforts to conserve nature should become part of culture and economic policy common to all of mankind.

A protocol, adopted at the conference's end, pointed out that a special programme for ecological education of large sections of people should be launched in the years 1989-1999 within the framework of UNESCO and the U.N. Environment Programme (UNEP).

The conference, organised by the International Projects Centre of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, was held under the UNESCO and UNEP auspices.

United States & Canada

Reagan Praises Treaty in Radio Address

LD192206 Moscow TASS in English 2137 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 19 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan described as "historic" the Treaty Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which was signed in the course of the recent Soviet-American summit meeting in Washington. In his regular Saturday radio address, the head of the U.S. Administration stressed that the treaty eliminates "an entire class of U.S. and Soviet INF missiles." President Reagan expressed confidence that the U.S. Senate would approve that highly important treaty.

White House, Congress Agree on Contra Aid

LD201647 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 20 TASS—The leaders of the U.S. Congress on Saturday reported that they have reached an agreement in principle with the administration on setting aside another portion of U.S. aid to the Nicaraguan contras. According to the compromise hammered out, eight million dollars in so-called humane aid are earmarked for the formations of the Nicaraguan counter-revolution.

Another White House demand was met: The Central Intelligence Agency was allowed to continue arms shipments to the Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries. True, being aware of the unpopularity of this decision inside the United States itself, the lawmakers were forced to set forth a condition. House Speaker James Wright said that President Reagan could resume arms transshipments if he submitted evidence that the Sandinist government was held responsible for the failure to achieve ceasefire in Nicaragua.

The issue of aid to the contras sparked off most heated debates between the White House and Capitol in drafting a compromise on the appropriations bill for fiscal 1988 that envisages government spending of 606 billion dollars. The U.S. Administration, which made the military backing of the contras central to its policy in Central America, had recourse to massive pressure on Congress.

President Reagan threatened to veto the entire bill. The administration sanctioned the closing of federal departments—the term of the Congress resolution on temporary funding of the operations of the federal departments was due to expire at mid-night on Saturday (the fiscal year began on October 1 in the absence of the appropriations law). James Miller, director of the management and budget office, issued an instruction to the heads of government departments to carry though the plans of closing departments on Monday.

Reagan used his regular Saturday radio address to the nation in an attempt to win Congress. In so doing, he permitted himself openly slanderous statements against the Government of sovereign Nicaragua, accusing it of planning "military dominance" in Central America, of "cynically manipulating the peace process trying to lull others into a false sense of security". The President saw in Nicaragua "an unprecedented threat to the national security of the United States". According to Reagan, U.S. support for "freedom fighters", as the President calls bandit formations of contras, is the sole way to "peace and democracy" in Nicaragua.

Charikov Comments on Aid

LD210014 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Igor Charikov commentary]

[Text] According to a report from Washington, the U.S. congressional leaders have reached agreement in principle with the White House on the matter of allocating the latest portion of U.S. aid to the Nicaraguan contras, amounting to $8 million. Thus, the administration has succeeded in satisfying one of its most unpopular budget demands. Here is the latest news commentary. Igor Charikov is at the microphone:

[Charikov] It has long since been clear that the White House has put all-around, primarily military and political, aid to the Nicaragua rebels at the center of its foreign policy in the Caribbean region. Using covert and overt means the administration has endeavored to strengthen with dollars and U.S. arms and ammunition the fighting spirit of the contras. Recall the effort President Reagan put into securing from the U.S. Congress the allocation of $1 billion, intended for so-called humanitarian aid, and how the CIA conducted a combination of many moves which, after it was exposed, was dubbed Irangate.

U.S. interference in Central America—attempts to exert influence over states in the region—aimed at preserving its dominant position and overturning the Sandinist leadership, have not added to the administration's prestige but have been conducive to it falling. There was a prolonged and stubborn struggle between the White House and Congress on this same issue. The legislators—some of whom, nevertheless, heed the opinion of Americans in their constituencies—resolutely rejected the White House's demand that the financial aid to the Somoza formations be legalized. Right up to last Saturday when the above- mentioned agreement with congressional leaders was reached, President Reagan tirelessly exerted pressure on both Congress and the public, resorting to fabrications with regard to the sincerity of the intentions of the government of sovereign Nicaragua.

It seems to me that a decisive role in the compromise with Congress was played not by a concession on the part of the congressmen, including the Democrats, but by the threat by President Reagan to impose his veto on the

whole bill on next year's federal budget, which to all intents and purposes began already on 1 November. A whole number of governmental institutions from the end of last week were under threat of remaining without resources. This is precisely how experienced Washington observers have assessed what has happened. Along with this they have noted that the legislators have nonetheless stipulated a condition under which the CIA will have the opportunity to continue the supply of weapons to the contras. The condition is that the CIA proves that the Sandinist government is at fault for an absence of a ceasefire. But when has the CIA been seen to observe a condition made upon it? When the need arises there are more than a few masters of falsifying events and assessments in this department.

In one way or another the administration has again demonstrated that it is continuing to count on a military solution to a settlement in Nicaragua and other Central American problems, rejecting all efforts to achieve these goals through peaceful means.

Zholkver on Presidential Campaign, Treaty

OW180927 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0715 GMT 17 Dec 87

[From the Vremya newscast; Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] On the eve of next year's U.S. presidential elections, all candidates of the two competing parties are forced to consider current popular opinion. Indeed, of the Republicans, only Vice President Bush so far expresses an unqualified support for the treaty eliminating nuclear missiles in two categories. Another candidate, Dole, the Senate Republican leader, was expressing all kinds of doubts and qualifications until recently. However, he also stated that the treaty will be ratified by the Senate.

The Democratic Party's candidates—there were six of them until today—unanimously supported the Washington treaty and its ratification. The Democratic candidates were joined today by Senator Gary Hart, who is probably the most popular candidate. You may remember, Comrades, that he had been a candidate previously but was forced to withdraw last spring after a noisy campaign of accusations of infidelity developed in the U.S. press. Now Hart has decided to rejoin the political struggle and take part in the campaign

The U.S. press, however, points at his weaknesses. These include not only the bygone scandal story but his lack of a solid financial base. Indeed, Hart is laying its foundation much later than other candidates who already have accumulated considerable funds. For example, Dole's campaign fund has already reached $8 million and Bush's fund is twice that. I shall remind you that, according to the U.S. press, Reagan's 1984 re-election cost him $68 million. Next year's election of a new U.S. President is expected to cost at least $80 million, maybe more.

Such are the political customs of the United States.

Bessmertnykh Presummit Interview on Relations

18120020 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 46, 23 Nov 87 pp 6-8

[Interview with Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy minister of foreign affairs, by NEW TIMES reporter Galina Sidorova: "The Art of Weighing Possibilities"; date and place not given]

[Text] Deputy Foreign Minister Alexander Bessmertnykh talks to our reporter Galina Sidorova about the problems confronting Soviet diplomacy, firmness and flexibility in politics, and the peculiar character of Soviet-American relations.

[Sidorova] As far as I know, your diplomatic career has for a long time been connected with the United States. Could it be said that our relations with that country are now entering a new channel, or that they are merely on a new upgrade to be followed by a decline, as has happened more than once in the past? And, in general, is stability possible in Soviet-American relations?

[Bessmertnykh] I have, indeed, been concerned with Soviet-American relations for some time, and this allows me to say that for the most part it has been a period of upsurges and declines. One is of course justified in asking why this has happened, and I can hardly keep myself from replying that the fault lies entirely with the United States. But this would be simplistic. Soviet-American relations are influenced by the state of affairs in the world, and subjective as well as objective factors interfere in them.

For all that, if Soviet-American relations are viewed as a formula, the variable factor in them will be the behaviour of the United States.

The Soviet Union has always needed stable relations with the United States. We have always realized that it is our principal opponent, our principal partner and, as likely as not, our principal potential military adversary. Besides, relations based on tension or aggravated by confrontation are basically alien to our foreign policy.

It will be recalled that when the Reagan administration came to power its official declared that they would not hold talks with Moscow on any issue, least of all on arms limitation. It was bluntly stated that the 1980s would be a period of building up U.S. military might, not of arms limitation.

From the outset of this dark period the Soviet Union has been trying to put its relations with the United States on a firm foundation, and today it can be said that the results of these efforts are self-evident. The Americans initiated negotiations with us and have now been holding them for several years. Both countries are on the threshold of considerable achievements. The first ever agreement on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles—medium- and shorter-range—is at hand. In fact, it is one large class of missiles with a range of action from 500 to 5,500 kilometres.

There are a number of reasons for this slow but steady change in direction. First of all, world opinion has veered in favour of disarmament. The new Soviet thinking is also exerting a strong influence. It is not merely breaking down stereotypes, some of which are bursting like soap bubbles. It is advancing a concrete, substantive policy.

This policy, I think started with Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15, 1986, in which he declared that the world can be freed of nuclear weapons. Many people abroad received it at first as a hypothetical and idealistic scheme. It should be admitted that not a few such plans had indeed been advanced in the past. I have in mind the general and complete disarmament for which we called in the 1960s, when the ground for it had not been sufficiently prepared.

It should frankly be said that even in our country some people thought it a utopian idea, a sort of civitas solis. The near-completion of an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles proves that the policy initiated then was correct. The January 15 statement was followed by the Reykjavik summit, and the latter by substantive talks on a wide range of issues—talks that are expected to culminate in the Washington summit on December 7.

Another reason for the change lies in U.S. policy. Many U.S. leaders are beginning to understand that there are limits to their country's potential. This also applies to economic potential. Many have realized that superarmament does not equal security. Moscow and Washington are talking more and more often about stability, pointing out that it is the criterion whereby not only military and strategic but also political relations between the two countries should be assessed.

Stability, in the broad sense of the word, should also include the promotion of economic relations. I think pure diplomacy, however clever it may be, is not enough in building relations with other countries. Take for instance the European and Asian countries. Relations with them are very often based on a combination of trade and cultural ties. In our relations with the United States, however, everything centres chiefly on the problem of security.

[Sidorova] Don't the Americans reproach us with this at various talks?

[Bessmertnykh] They are putting the emphasis on other issues, and we agree with them. I think it is difficult to fix priorities in Soviet-American relations and say: The economy comes second, culture third, human rights fourth, regional problems fifth, and so on. All this plainly depends on the period in question and the combination should be determined by the specific situation. I often use the expression "the fabric of relations." Like a safety net at a circus, this fabric should keep relations from breaking down in a critical situation. It is therefore necessary to constantly strengthen this fabric in every possible way.

Mention should clearly be made of confidence—a cardinal issue in Soviet-American relations. Perhaps it is the most important cord in the safety net.

[Sidorova] Leaving Soviet-American relations aside for a moment, I would like to ask you a question which is perhaps a little naive but which is raised increasingly frequently in letters from our readers. They are a number of pressing issues at home. Are not foreign affairs given too much attention?

[Bessmertnykh] I would reply in this way: the people and the national economy have to pay a very high price for a bad foreign policy, mainly because such a policy does not ensure the peaceful development of the international situation. A tense situation leads to arms buildup and calls for the exertion of efforts and the diversion to other purposes of funds needed for the main branches of the economy. A bad policy also exerts psychological pressure on the nation and has an adverse effect on public feeling.

Domestic and foreign policies are like Siamese twins. A sound economy is, in my opinion, an earnest of a successful policy. Some of our economic difficulties are like fetters on our foreign policy. We would perhaps advance more rapidly in a number of fields if progress in them were not hindered by the shortcomings of our economic policy.

For instance, the situation in Soviet-American relations would be greatly facilitated by successes in our agriculture. At present we have to buy a certain amount of grain from the United States. Perhaps this is expedient from the economic point of view, but from the political point of view it would be better to do without these purchases.

[Sidorova] How are new features of our domestic policy manifested concretely in our foreign policy?

[Bessmertnykh] They are manifested primarily in the overall sense of freedom of manoeuvre in seeking solutions, the boldness of decisions, and independence in decisionmaking.

In the past, we had little choice in seeking answers to problems, as we felt the pressure of long-standing traditions. Incidentally, many of these traditions, many of which are of undeniable value, have been preserved to

this day, for diplomacy is a profession that observes traditions. Nevertheless, I repeat, the general atmosphere of freedom helps us find unexpected, very useful and very advantageous solutions. Soviet foreign policy is also directly influenced by one more feature of our present life, namely dynamism.

In a talk with George Shultz recently Mikhail Gorbachev described the present phase in Soviet-American relations as one of dynamization. This is also manifested in our ties with other countries. We at the Foreign Ministry have learned with surprise that a number of steps over the last two years were unprecedented in the history of Soviet diplomacy. For instance, the first visit by a Soviet Foreign Minister to Mongolia, and the first to Mexico over the 50 years of diplomatic relations with that country.

[Sidorova] What is Soviet diplomacy, or rather Soviet foreign policy, lacking today? Flexibility perhaps? Do you think that, especially at negotiations, we have often driven ourselves into a corner by initially adopting a tough stand and retreating from it some time later, by linking several issues together in a package and then unlinking them? Perhaps our method of negotiation has become outdated, and it is a question merely of technique?

[Bessmertnykh] This question should be examined more carefully. First of all, firmness and flexibility are not synonymous, nor are they mutually exclusive. As for toughness and flexibility, they are indeed diametrically opposed. Firmness in policy—I think this applies to diplomacy too—means steadfastly advancing to the goal that has been set. Flexibility is a method with which this goal can be achieved. Firmness can be combined with a certain flexibility. Sometimes it is advisable to take one step back in order then to take two steps forward.

I would put the question you have raised as follows: Before any negotiations, or in the course of evaluating relations with one or other country, it is very important clearly to define the goal of policy which should be based on the explicitly determined interests of the state. These interests are sometimes influenced by emotional responses to developments in the international situation. An emotional response may, in its turn, provoke a sharp counter-response that will subsequently be deplored.

So, a cool-headed, well-balanced approach is absolutely essential in foreign policy, as is the importance of balancing one's interests against those of other countries. It is aptly said that diplomacy is the art of the possible. We are trying to take as many factors as possible into account and, as in chess, to look several moves ahead.

[Sidorova] Are you managing to do that?

[Bessmertnykh] Well, we are trying to do our best. Among the factors contributing to our efforts I would note the present atmosphere of innovation and creativity in the analysis of problems. It is impossible to build a policy on the basis of a single option available at a given moment. There must be several options. You compare all of them, from the worst to the best, and choose a policy that is usually close to what is called the golden mean.

[Sidorova] This means you choose the optimal policy?

[Bessmertnykh] In foreign policy it is difficult to choose the line that will smoothly reach the target you have set, influenced as it is by a great many extraneous forces. For this reason a number of decisions have clearly not been optimal.

[Sidorova] For instance?

[Bessmertnykh] Somewhat different calculations could have been made, in my opinion, when our security goals on the European continent were being defined. I feel that the effective development of our technology rather than political analysis influenced the adoption of some decisions. Take medium-range missiles, for instance. We had quite enough SS-4 and SS-5 missiles in Europe. Then we began to deploy SS-20s. Technically, they are more perfect. But the question is how they fitted into our military-strategic concept in the European theatre. I repeat: National interests must determine strategy, while strategy must determine political tactics and, to a certain extent, the technological development of the armed forces.

[Sidorova] Let us turn to the latest events—the recent meetings between the Soviet and U.S. foreign ministers in Moscow and Washington. For the journalists present at the Shultz-Shevardnadze press conference in Moscow, things looked like this: The interests of the sides did not coincide and their views had not drawn closer. This disappointed the journalists, for they had been particularly expecting an announcement about a new summit meeting. But a week later they learned of the triumph of political realism in Washington. Does that mean the positions have changed?

[Bessmertnykh] The journalists were disappointed because the main thing for them was the date of a summit. This is an important factor, of course. The most important thing, however, is the content of a third summit with the U.S. President, the objectives both leaders will be trying to achieve.

Two concepts of the summit actually came together in Moscow, but they did not coincide. In a talk with Shultz last April, Mikhail Gorbachev proposed that the sides complete the drafting of a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles and lay the basis for a future agreement on strategic offensive weapons. It was also proposed in April that the key provisions of such an accord could be worked out.

[Bessmertnykh] The ABM Treaty does not ban absolutely everything. It forbids the creation of anti-missile defence in space, as well as land-mobile defence, anti-missile defence for the entire territory of a country, and so on. Nevertheless, extensive work is being carried out in space, and not only for military satellites too.

bored us with their talk about sublevels. We told them: You want sublevels, here they are. It only remains now to take calculators or electronic computers, check strategic doctrines, plans and policy with their help, and offer each other mutually acceptable figures.

[Sidorova] One more question. Why are sea-based cruise missiles not mentioned in connection with negotiations? Is there tacit agreement between the sides in this respect?

[Bessmertnykh] There is no such agreement. We have always spoken about these missiles.

[Sidorova] Why then are they not mentioned in the latest Soviet proposal on sublevels?

[Bessmertnykh] This is simply because you did not have the chance to read the verbatim report on the talks. The question of limits for sea-based cruise missiles is an absolutely indispensable and crucial aspect of any treaty on strategic offensive weapons. We cannot permit a situation where—with a 50 per cent reduction of the triad—this type of weapon is left aside. At the Reykjavik summit the sides agreed in principle that, in addition to a 50 per cent reduction, limits will also be set for sea-based cruise missiles. We are now talking about a definite and compulsory limitation of these missiles.

[Sidorova] Regardless of a 50 per cent reduction?

[Bessmertnykh] The limitation of sea-based cruise missiles will accompany a 50 percent reduction, as they are not included in the 6,000 warheads.

[Sidorova] Is it planned to cut the number of sea-based cruise missiles by half, like all other weapons?

[Bessmertnykh] It is impossible to cut it by half, as this programme is only beginning to develop.

[Sidorova] In other words, we want to find the ceiling?

[Bessmertnykh] That's right. The Americans are planning to build 4,000 sea-based cruise missiles, most of them with nuclear warheads. A sharply reduced level, equal for both sides, must be fixed for these strategic nuclear-tipped missiles.

[Sidorova] In retaliation to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe, we have installed our operational-tactical missiles in Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic and moved our submarines closer to the U.S. shores. Where will these submarines go if the appropriate agreements are signed?

[Bessmertnykh] The submarines are a reaction to the overall strategic situation that would arise if the United States deployed all its medium-range and cruise missiles in Europe. As for the Soviet shorter-range missiles sited

this day, for diplomacy is a profession that observes traditions. Nevertheless, I repeat, the general atmosphere of freedom helps us find unexpected, very useful and very advantageous solutions. Soviet foreign policy is also directly influenced by one more feature of our present life, namely dynamism.

In a talk with George Shultz recently Mikhail Gorbachev described the present phase in Soviet-American relations as one of dynamization. This is also manifested in our ties with other countries. We at the Foreign Ministry have learned with surprise that a number of steps over the last two years were unprecedented in the history of Soviet diplomacy. For instance, the first visit by a Soviet Foreign Minister to Mongolia, and the first to Mexico over the 50 years of diplomatic relations with that country.

[Sidorova] What is Soviet diplomacy, or rather Soviet foreign policy, lacking today? Flexibility perhaps? Do you think that, especially at negotiations, we have often driven ourselves into a corner by initially adopting a tough stand and retreating from it some time later, by linking several issues together in a package and then unlinking them? Perhaps our method of negotiation has become outdated, and it is a question merely of technique?

[Bessmertnykh] This question should be examined more carefully. First of all, firmness and flexibility are not synonymous, nor are they mutually exclusive. As for toughness and flexibility, they are indeed diametrically opposed. Firmness in policy—I think this applies to diplomacy too—means steadfastly advancing to the goal that has been set. Flexibility is a method with which this goal can be achieved. Firmness can be combined with a certain flexibility. Sometimes it is advisable to take one step back in order then to take two steps forward.

I would put the question you have raised as follows: Before any negotiations, or in the course of evaluating relations with one or other country, it is very important clearly to define the goal of policy which should be based on the explicitly determined interests of the state. These interests are sometimes influenced by emotional responses to developments in the international situation. An emotional response may, in its turn, provoke a sharp counter-response that will subsequently be deplored.

So, a cool-headed, well-balanced approach is absolutely essential in foreign policy, as is the importance of balancing one's interests against those of other countries. It is aptly said that diplomacy is the art of the possible. We are trying to take as many factors as possible into account and, as in chess, to look several moves ahead.

[Sidorova] Are you managing to do that?

[Bessmertnykh] Well, we are trying to do our best. Among the factors contributing to our efforts I would note the present atmosphere of innovation and creativity in the analysis of problems. It is impossible to build a policy on the basis of a single option available at a given moment. There must be several options. You compare all of them, from the worst to the best, and choose a policy that is usually close to what is called the golden mean.

[Sidorova] This means you choose the optimal policy?

[Bessmertnykh] In foreign policy it is difficult to choose the line that will smoothly reach the target you have set, influenced as it is by a great many extraneous forces. For this reason a number of decisions have clearly not been optimal.

[Sidorova] For instance?

[Bessmertnykh] Somewhat different calculations could have been made, in my opinion, when our security goals on the European continent were being defined. I feel that the effective development of our technology rather than political analysis influenced the adoption of some decisions. Take medium-range missiles, for instance. We had quite enough SS-4 and SS-5 missiles in Europe. Then we began to deploy SS-20s. Technically, they are more perfect. But the question is how they fitted into our military-strategic concept in the European theatre. I repeat: National interests must determine strategy, while strategy must determine political tactics and, to a certain extent, the technological development of the armed forces.

[Sidorova] Let us turn to the latest events—the recent meetings between the Soviet and U.S. foreign ministers in Moscow and Washington. For the journalists present at the Shultz-Shevardnadze press conference in Moscow, things looked like this: The interests of the sides did not coincide and their views had not drawn closer. This disappointed the journalists, for they had been particularly expecting an announcement about a new summit meeting. But a week later they learned of the triumph of political realism in Washington. Does that mean the positions have changed?

[Bessmertnykh] The journalists were disappointed because the main thing for them was the date of a summit. This is an important factor, of course. The most important thing, however, is the content of a third summit with the U.S. President, the objectives both leaders will be trying to achieve.

Two concepts of the summit actually came together in Moscow, but they did not coincide. In a talk with Shultz last April, Mikhail Gorbachev proposed that the sides complete the drafting of a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles and lay the basis for a future agreement on strategic offensive weapons. It was also proposed in April that the key provisions of such an accord could be worked out.

The concept brought by Shultz and Carlucci to Moscow in October included the signing of a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles and an impressive list of ceremonies. But it pushed into the background the question of a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive weapons, agreement on which had been reached in principle in Reykjavik.

Since a single concept and the agenda of talks were not agreed on in Moscow, Mikhail Gorbachev told George Shultz that he would send a personal letter to Ronald Reagan to explain once again how he (Gorbachev) saw his future meeting with the President. The letter was written very quickly, and the Soviet [illegible]n minister was instructed to hand it to the Presid[illegible]n additional explanation of our concept.

Why, nevertheless, was the date [illegible] in Washington? In the U.S. capita[illegible] sive talks on the basis of Mikhail G[illegible] the sides finally agreed that, first, [illegible] like visit with a tight schedule an[illegible] would be focussed on a 50 per cent [illegible]gic offensive weapons. To be sure, the [illegible] reduction of these weapons arose both in Moscow and Washington. The Soviet Union believes that it is impossible to make such drastic cuts and not guarantee security with an appropriate system of stability provided by observance of the ABM Treaty.

A new discussion over the ABM Treaty began. It was agreed in Washington that the two sides will also thrash out the question of non-withdrawal from the treaty (that is, for a certain agreed period they will renounce the right to withdraw from it) and of observance of it in the future. I emphasize these words, because it took us several hours to discuss one word, "observance," which was then included in a joint communique. We have not yet reached agreement on the term "non-withdrawal," but it will be a subject of future talks.

And, finally, the main thing: We have agreed—on the basis of the idea formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev last April—that the two leaders will lay some of the groundwork for a future treaty on strategic offensive weapons. In the past, we called this groundwork the key provisions of a future treaty. But this time we used a new euphemism: instructions for the delegations. In effect, it is one and the same thing. In other words, the concept put forward by us in April has been adopted by the American side, and that is why the date of a summit has become real.

[Sidorova] In connection with the Washington talks, some Western journalists are writing about a "softening" of the Soviet position on the SDI. At the same time, both sides stressed that none of them had made concessions on this question. Where is the truth?

[Bessmertnykh] First of all, SDI is an American programme, which is not a subject of our negotiations. The Americans claim that they are conducting research in this field. We are working out countermeasures—asymmetrical and cheaper ones. They are not a subject of negotiations either. But there is something that we can and must talk about—and that is a system of stability guarantees provided by the ABM Treaty, which forbids certain actions.

If we reach agreement on non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty for a definite period of time, it will guarantee a stability on the basis of which a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive weapons can be effected. In the West, many switch the talk about guarantees through strengthening the ABM Treaty to another subject: Do we or do we not agree with SDI and will we soften our position on this programme? I can say that, regardless of talks, our position is absolutely clear: SDI, if practical steps were taken to implement it, would run counter to the ABM Treaty.

[Sidorova] But the Americans have already begun to create it.

[Bessmertnykh] What do you mean by saying "create"? Nobody has as yet begun to create the system in real terms, and in general, SDI, as a concept, is visibly undergoing a transformation. For instance, the programme Ronald Reagan spoke of in 1983 is no longer accepted as real even in the United States. This can be concluded from the recent reports of American physicists and the statements of some administration officials. This means that something else will be developed—SDI-2, as some people say. Something, but not an impenetrable shield over the United States.

The Americans are spreading a powerful campaign of misinformation about their SDI programme trying to produce in our country a feeling of being greatly threatened and to direct our scientific and technological thought into a blind alley. But today we know well enough what they are really talking about. That is why we are working on countermeasures that could be produced if SDI is brought to fruition. But I stress once again: This can and must be avoided.

[Sidorova] Nevertheless, at the previous summit meetings, both we and Americans spoke about SDI. Perhaps our position has changed.

[Bessmertnykh] We spoke about SDI as a threat to the ABM Treaty. This treaty, which we must preserve and strictly observe, has always been in the centre of negotiations. That is the key to understanding the situation.

[Sidorova] But the Americans have been returning to the question of the SDI, and we have made a sort of technical adjustment to the Soviet position on tests in outer space.

[Bessmertnykh] The ABM Treaty does not ban absolutely everything. It forbids the creation of anti-missile defence in space, as well as land-mobile defence, anti-missile defence for the entire territory of a country, and so on. Nevertheless, extensive work is being carried out in space, and not only for peaceful exploration. Military satellites, technical reconnaissance and communication satellites have been launched in space. We have proposed to the Americans that a list be compiled of devices that would be banned from space. Theoretically, a device not included in the list could be put in space. The Americans pretend not to understand the pragmatic logic of this approach. At the talks in Washington last September we proposed to determine, in addition to the list of devices, their parameters and the levels of their technical specifications. Devices with characteristics below these levels could be tested, as the ABM Treaty does not extend to them.

[Sidorova] Do you think an agreement on strategic offensive weapons possible? How important is the question of sublevels? Is it a stumbling block?

[Bessmertnykh] A treaty on a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive weapons is possible. However, a strong political impulse in the form of instructions to the delegations should be given to it at the forthcoming meeting in Washington. It will, of course, be necessary to solve problems involving the structure of the strategic triads.

We proceed above all from the fact that the triads have evolved historically, and the sides have different geopolitical positions. It is impossible to cut the same suit for two men with completely different figures. That is why our arsenals, being different in their structures, need different internal configurations. But this does not mean we are opposed to fixing some levels for the concentration of warheads on the three principal elements of the strategic triad.

[Sidorova] The Soviet position on sublevels is therefore determined by the "different suits" approach.

[Bessmertnykh] Exactly. We have offered the Americans a neat diplomatic solution to the problem by proposing a numerical range for each element of the triad: from 3,000 to 3,300 warheads on land-based ballistic missiles; from 1,800 to 2,000 warheads on submarine-based ballistic missiles, and from 800 to 900 warheads on air-based cruise missiles. One should have the wit to find the combination of warheads acceptable to both sides.

[Sidorova] But the Americans today have considerably fewer warheads on their intercontinental ballistic missiles.

[Bessmertnykh] That is their business. For instance, they have more warheads on their submarine-launched ballistic missiles. There will be one level for both the Soviet Union and the United States—6,000. The Americans bored us with their talk about sublevels. We told them: You want sublevels, here they are. It only remains now to take calculators or electronic computers, check strategic doctrines, plans and policy with their help, and offer each other mutually acceptable figures.

[Sidorova] One more question. Why are sea-based cruise missiles not mentioned in connection with negotiations? Is there tacit agreement between the sides in this respect?

[Bessmertnykh] There is no such agreement. We have always spoken about these missiles.

[Sidorova] Why then are they not mentioned in the latest Soviet proposal on sublevels?

[Bessmertnykh] This is simply because you did not have the chance to read the verbatim report on the talks. The question of limits for sea-based cruise missiles is an absolutely indispensable and crucial aspect of any treaty on strategic offensive weapons. We cannot permit a situation where—with a 50 per cent reduction of the triad—this type of weapon is left aside. At the Reykjavik summit the sides agreed in principle that, in addition to a 50 per cent reduction, limits will also be set for sea-based cruise missiles. We are now talking about a definite and compulsory limitation of these missiles.

[Sidorova] Regardless of a 50 per cent reduction?

[Bessmertnykh] The limitation of sea-based cruise missiles will accompany a 50 percent reduction, as they are not included in the 6,000 warheads.

[Sidorova] Is it planned to cut the number of sea-based cruise missiles by half, like all other weapons?

[Bessmertnykh] It is impossible to cut it by half, as this programme is only beginning to develop.

[Sidorova] In other words, we want to find the ceiling?

[Bessmertnykh] That's right. The Americans are planning to build 4,000 sea-based cruise missiles, most of them with nuclear warheads. A sharply reduced level, equal for both sides, must be fixed for these strategic nuclear-tipped missiles.

[Sidorova] In retaliation to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe, we have installed our operational-tactical missiles in Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic and moved our submarines closer to the U.S. shores. Where will these submarines go if the appropriate agreements are signed?

[Bessmertnykh] The submarines are a reaction to the overall strategic situation that would arise if the United States deployed all its medium-range and cruise missiles in Europe. As for the Soviet shorter-range missiles sited

in Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, last April I went to these countries as a representative of the Soviet leadership to sound out their attitude to the inspections that will be required at the time of dismantling the missiles on their territories. Our allies have supported us.

[Sidorova] Let us return to summit meetings. What makes them important? Why do we not hold them more often if, as the past few years have shown, they really help to bring about a certain relaxation in the international situation?

[Bessmertnykh] Well, it is a very important aspect. The top leaders indeed take a broader view of the world situation and a statesmanlike approach to the interest of their respective countries. This is one of the paramount aspects of their meetings. Secondly, they seem to predetermine the prospective strategy of mutual relations. Thirdly, personal meetings help them better to understand each other's way of thinking. They increase trust and lessen the likelihood of mistakes. Fourthly, the top leaders demonstrate to their countries and the whole world that the Soviet Union and the United States want to establish civilized relations. So, summits are very important as a symbol. In the present circumstances, I think, they are a very important form of diplomatic activity as such.

[Sidorova] This means the top leaders should meet more frequently.

[Bessmertnykh] I think this is the present trend. High-level meetings with the Americans have, in fact, been held every year in the recent period—1985, 1986, 1987. Each of these meetings has not only advanced our relations and made our world a safer place to live in. It has given the world hopes of a tranquil future.

Report Cites U.S. 'Human Rights Violations'

LD181111 Moscow TASS in English 1053 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Shyto[illegible].

Numerous cases of human rights violations in the USA are cited in the new report issued by the Centre for Constitutional Rights, an American lawyers' organization. The report is a collection of categorized information of more than 100 trials on charges of various violations of political, social and economic rights of Americans.

Follow some examples giving an idea of the content of the report. Well-known woman writer Margaret Randall, whose case is listed as number 45, is fighting against the attempts of the American authorities to expel her out of the country. She is accused of propagating in her works the doctrine of world communism in violation of the McCaran-Walter Law. As is pointed out in the footnotes, on the basis of that law passed in the era of McCarthyism such writers of world renown as Pablo Neruda, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Graham Greene, Carlos Fuentes and Farley Mowat were once denied entry visas. The Centre for Constitutional Rights lodged a cross-complaint on behalf of Randall, which was supported by her colleagues Kurt Vonnegut, Arthur Miller, Norman Mailer and others.

The widespread unlawful electronic spying under the pretext of ensuring national security is one of the forms of abuse of power by the government, says the explanatory note to case number 56. Professor (law) Arthur Kinoy, one of the founders of the Centre for Constitutional Rights, exposed FBI's clandestine operation of mass spying on "suspects" including his own self and instituted proceedings in court. The crudest violation of constitutional rights is indisputable. Yet the judicial authorities are not in a hurry to pass a decision and are so far examining the appeal from the authorities.

Under the Reagan administration the housing crisis has grown to reach an enormous scale. The struggle for accessible housing has come into the forefront of actions for the economic rights in the eighties, says the introduction to the next chapter. It deals with the tragic plight of the Americans who lost their homes or are threatened with eviction. Other chapters deal with manifestations of racism in the legal system of the USA. Victimisation of the American Indians and fighters for the independence of Puerto Rico, repressions against the participants in the anti-war movement.

Yet, the TASS correspondent was told in interview by David Lerner, a spokesman for the Centre for Constitutional Rights, the collection by no means lists all the facts of the trampling of constitutional rights and freedoms in the United States. This is simply impossible within the framework of one report. Therefore the new report includes only the trials which were started or continued during the past year.

PRAVDA Carries U.S. SDI Test Report

PM181645 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Under the SDI Program"]

[Text] Washington, 15 Dec—The United States has conducted the first test of elements of the control and monitoring system [sistema upravleniya i kontrolya] under the "Star Wars" program using an ICBM, the newspaper DEFENSE NEWS has reported. During the experiment ground-, air-, and space-based sensors tracked its flight for 30 minutes, checking the trajectory parameters from the moment it was launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base until it fell into the Pacific. A device was working simultaneously to distinguish between real and false targets.

The tests and experiments currently being conducted under the SDI program will sooner or later face the United States with the need to broaden its interpretation of the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty, C. Powell, the President's assistant for national security affairs, declared in an interview on channels of the Worldnet television network. While noting that the Soviet side insists on the traditional interpretation of that document, at the same time he emphasized that the United States reserves the right to deploy a large-scale ABM system. M. Fitzwater, the President's assistant for press relations, declared that the U.S. Administration "intends to continue the program right up to the deployment" of a space ABM system.

Joint Fishing Expedition Sets Out

LD181049 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Vladivostok December 18 TASS—A big fishing freezer trawler, "The Aleksandr Krayev", registered at Port Nakhodka, Soviet Far East, set out on a joint Soviet-American fishing expedition to the Bering Sea today.

Together with American fishermen, the trawler's crew will catch and process cod. The current expedition was organised by the Soviet-American company on marine resources.

Another Soviet-American expedition, in which eight Nakhodha crews will take part, is to be launched in 1988. In the meanwhile, the fishermen are finishing operations for the voyage—fitting out their vessels and checking ship systems.

A total of 240,000 tons of fish will be caught and processed as a result of Soviet-American fishing campaigns next year.

China

China Supports Nuclear Disarmament Policy

OW202332 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] China has expressed its agreement with the policy of nuclear disarmament, which is an extremely good thing.

Soviet Major General (Bacheny), a military expert of the CPSU Central Committee, made this statement at a press briefing in Moscow. He said: China has a great potential for developing nuclear weapons, and this policy is particularly important in this regard. Major General (Bacheny) hoped that the INF Treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States would become a signal to other countries that also possess such weapons.

USSR, PRC Agree To Air Link of Cities

LD200154 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0832 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Khabarovsk, 19 December (TASS)—A new airlink is to join the Soviet Far Eastern town of Khabarovsk with Harbin, a major center in northeastern China. An accord on this has been reached between representatives of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation and the PRC's Main Administration of Civil Aviation. Regular flights are planned to start at the beginning of next year. These will be carried out by Soviet and Chinese crews alternately.

Wang Guixiang, head of the PRC delegation, called the prospects for cooperation between the aviators very promising. The new link, he noted in a conversation with a TASS correspondent, will promote further development of commercial and economic, cultural, and other ties between the Far East region of the USSR and the adjacent provinces of China. In recent years, such ties have been tangibly stepped up.

Khabarovsk airport takes second place for transport intensity in the USSR after Moscow' Domodedovo airport. Its technical capacities enable it to accept all types of aircraft. Khabarovsk has direct air communications with more than 70 cities in the Soviet Union. Regular flights depart from here to Japan and the DPRK, as well as charter flights to other foreign countries.

Moscow Gathering Marks Guangzhou Uprising

OW190855 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Excerpts] On 15 December, an evening party was held at the Moscow Home of Friendship for People of All Countries to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Chinese workers uprising in Guangzhou in 1927.

A station reporter says that attending the evening party, which was held by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, were Soviet sinologists, activists of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, and representatives of various circles in Moscow. Minister Li Fenglin and other officials of the Chinese Embassy in the Soviet Union also attended the evening party.

Professor Grunin, Soviet sinologist and doctor of history, made a report at the evening party on the Chinese workers uprising in Guangzhou in December 1927. [passage omitted]

Comrade Grunin said: The Guangzhou uprising, which was also known as the Guangzhou commune, although showing brilliance for only a short period, left an indelible impression on people then, as well as in later periods. [passage omitted]

In conclusion, Professor Grunin said: When we commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Guangzhou uprising today, we must respect the heroic deeds of those who took part in the uprising, the Chinese people, and the revolutionary tradition of the Communist Party of China.

Beijing Scientific, Technological Meeting Held

OW181211 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Excerpts] The second meeting of the Soviet-Chinese Scientific and Technological Cooperation Mixed Committee ended a few days ago in Beijing. In this connection, station observer Dmitriyev has the following comments:

The cooperation between the Soviet Union and China in the field of science and technology has developed on the basis of the 5-year agreement signed between the Soviet and Chinese Governments at the end of 1984. Based on the experience of the initial months following the signing of the agreement, it became apparent that it is necessary to establish a special organization to coordinate and plan contacts between the two countries in the field of science and technology. Accordingly, a committee on cooperation in the field of science and technology was established under the Committee for Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technological Cooperation between the Soviet Union and China in March 1986.

The first meeting of the Soviet-Chinese Scientific and Technological Cooperation Mixed Committee was convened in Moscow in autumn 1986. At that meeting, scholars and experts of both countries in the fields of agriculture, nonferrous metal, chemistry, petrochemical industry, petroleum and natural gas production, manufacturing of machinery, railway transportation, and public health work formulated specific goals and subjects for the cooperation.

In the second meeting of the permanent committee, both sides summed up results of cooperation during the past year. [passage omitted] (Charshinov), member of the Soviet delegation and responsible person of the State Committee for Science and Technology, pointed out that departments concerned in the cooperation are all satisfied with their work, and 12 long-term cooperation agreements for 1988 were signed. He said that the meeting also approved namelists of delegations from both countries for next year. Delegations of the Soviet Ministry of Fish Industry, Ministry of Electrical Equipment Industry, Ministry of Construction, Ministry of Transport Construction, Ministry of Machine Building and other departments will visit China, while delegations of the Chinese Ministry of Metallurgical Industry, Ministry of Electrical Equipment Industry [as heard] and Ministry of Chemical Industry, and specialists in the field of chemical fertilizer and agriculture will visit the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

Both sides decided that on the occasion of the 71st anniversary of the October Revolution, namely on 7 November 1988, Soviet scientific and technological day activities will be held in China. [passage omitted] (Charshinov) also said that the Soviet delegation that attended the second meeting of the Soviet-Chinese Scientific and Technological Cooperation Mixed Committee was warmly received. The work was very hectic, but it was conducted in a friendly atmosphere and in the spirit of seeking truth from facts. All our problems were understood by the Chinese side. We visited Harbin and Tianjin and were received by Yan Jici, vice chairman of the Standing Committee of the Chinese National People's Congress. We are convinced that this showed that the Chinese side has attached importance to the work of the committee's doing a good job and developing scientific and technological cooperation between the two countries. He said: We are quite satisfied with the results of the second meeting of the mixed committee, and we will do our best to realize cooperation projects formulated by the meeting.

Both sides of the mixed committee have decided that the next meeting of the permanent Soviet-Chinese Scientific and Technological Cooperation Mixed Committee will be held in Moscow a year later.

Competition for PRC Posts Described

PM181235 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "Contract Director"]

[Text] Beijing—The scenario of the competition to fill the post of director of the Beijing washing machine factory was marked by a particular sense of drama. When the city authorities [pravitelstvo] decided to announce the competition, many of the enterprise's workers were doubtful. The director, Liang Biao, is a worthy man who enjoys respect. The enterprise, which he has led for more than 7 years, is one of the leaders in the sector and produces one-fourth of all the country's washing machines. The "White Chrysanthemum" label is one of the most popular on the market. Some people wondered whether, if a change of management took place, would it be for the good?

Liang Biao thought otherwise. He was a true supporter of reform and experiment and entered the competition along with 47 other competitors. He won the first round without difficulty: His professionalism and experience made an impact. But when the debates on development strategy began, an opponent appeared—32-year old Wang Yang, a graduate from the "Jinghau" polytechnical university and chief of the capital's metallurgical

combine technical department. All the same, the authoritative commission of representatives of the city authorities, factory workers, and economic experts weighed up all the "pros" and "cons" and preferred Liang Biao.

So the old director returned to his usual office. Was it worth holding the competition? Yes, it was worth it, for the essence of the new director's work is now fundamentally different from his precompetition work. He has signed a contract for 4 years with Beijing's general light industry corporation, to whom the factory is affiliated. According to the terms of the contract, he is obliged to secure a profit of 50 million yuans. But this is only part of his commitments. Now the enterprise will conduct an experiment with the "system of directorial responsibility for use of funds" (along with the contract and leasing, this is one of the three most widespread forms of mechanism for implementing the enterprise's real rights).

The contract stipulates the overall size of the fixed and working capital and the package of technical patents in use and the enterprise's actual authority have been assessed. The director's professional standard will be assessed according to these criteria: how successfully he is able to manage all this and, this is the main thing, whether he will be able to enhance the enterprise's prestige. But this is a gamble on long-term interest rather than on immediate benefit at any price, whereby many enterprises, as they say in China, "drained the pond to catch the fish" or "killed the hen to get the egg."

Observers point out other fundamental important features of the new competitive system. Above all, it is a splendid school for the competitors: both winners and losers. One Nie Weiding, former deputy director of the Beijing Instrument Factory, had long had a taste for technical production management, but according to the staff roster he had to tackle strictly administrative questions. When the competition was announced for the post of director of an electrical equipment factory, he put himself forward on the list of candidates. He lost in a fierce struggle in the last round. But he had faith in his efforts, and when a competition was held at his plant, he entered the competition—and won.

RENMIN RIBAO has written that 160 people took part in the competition for managerial posts within the Shenyang machine building industry system. Three people were elected, but the businesslike and moral qualities of many of the candidates were rated quite highly: These were candidates for leadership posts.

Incidentally, director Liang Biao, who returned to his office, is a rare exception. RENMIN RIBAO pointed out that as a result of the successful experiment with the directors' competition, 448 new leaders have appeared in 5 cities. Freer cadre movement is the new trend in China, where the system of "lifelong tenure of posts" was traditionally in operation.

Thus, relations between director Liang Biao and the state are now founded on the basis of a contract. This, observers note, is a feature of the new system of cadre selection at state enterprises. Hitherto, the director was effectively a departmental cadre employee, and his post was on the payroll of a particular institution.

Now there are also broader rights to accord with the director's greater independence: He is able to hire (also under contract) and dismiss cadres and to determine the structure of the apparatus and the size of wages and bonuses, (within certain limits, of course). Naturally, this increases his responsibility. Yet in 4 years, if his activity is deemed to be unsuccessful, he will lose his post and with it the monetary security he gained on signing the contract. Risky? Yes, but it is precisely such people, capable of initiative, creative work, and risk-taking, who are the product of reform.

Northeast Asia

Soviet-Japanese Science Commission Meets

LD190449 MOSCOW TASS in English 2050 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—A programme of joint work for 1988 has been discussed and endorsed by the Soviet-Japanese commission on scientific-technical cooperation, a TASS correspondent has been told by Valeriy Mikhaylov, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for Science and Technology. He presided over the commission's fourth session which ended here today. The Japanese delegation was led by Kazutoshi Hasegawa, general director of the Department of European Countries and Oceania of the Foreign Ministry of Japan.

The programme, for the first time since the formation of the commission, has outlined concrete themes of cooperation between governmental scientific institutions of the two countries, said Valeriy Mikhaylov. The partners intend to have a broad exchange of information, delegations of scientists and specialists, to carry out scientific research and joint developments, specifically in such areas as medicine, agriculture, biotechnology, science of machines, controlled thermo-nuclear synthesis.

Successful implementation of the programme, said the head of the Soviet delegation, might provide a good foundation for further development of bilateral relations on science and technology. On our part, he said, we are ready for the broadest cooperation with Japanese scientific organizations in different spheres of fundamental and applies sciences.

The next, 5th session of the commission is to be held in Japan next year.

Japan's Nuclear Policy 'Lacks Consistency'

OW180935 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 14 Dec 87

[From "Peace and Disarmament" program: (Kanalin) "On the Outcome of the USSR-U.S. Summit"]

[Excerpts] The USSR-U.S. INF Treaty on Eliminating Medium- and Short-Range Missiles signed in Washington has laid the legal foundations to dismantle an entire class of nuclear missiles on a global basis. The signing has marked the first step toward a realistic disarmament. Those missiles are being eliminated not because they have become obsolete and need to be replaced, but because both sides have recognized the need for their elimination. At the same time, the treaty has proved that the two sides can reach compromises if they maintain their goodwill, however far apart they might be at the beginning of negotiations.

The vital importance of this experience is not limited to a settlement on a global issue; it points to a realistic way to ease regional tensions including that in the Asia-Pacific region.

The treaty frees the Asia-Pacific region from medium-range missiles, virtually bringing the vast region into the nuclear weapons elimination process. This has been made possible not only by the good of the Soviet Union and the United States but also by the upsurge of antinuclear movements in Asian and Pacific countries. [passage omitted]

The fact that Japan is paying increasingly greater attention to nuclear disarmament issues is nothing unusual when one considers the role this country is playing in the world. At the same time, it should be noted that Japan lacks consistency in its approach to nuclear disarmament. For example, while paying lip service to the cause of nuclear arms elimination, Japan supports the U.S. approach of preserving nuclear weapons as a deterrent. Furthermore, while asserting the need for peaceful development of space, the Japanese Government decided to take part in the SDI program. It is hoped that this inconsistency on part of Japanese leadership is a temporary one. Recent remarks by Japanese public figures supporting the result of General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to Washington have brought hope to people.

It is undoubtedly important that Japan show a constructive and consistent posture over issues of easing international tension. For Japan, an important member of international society, it is fully possible to help build a favorable climate for resolving fundamental problems of mankind, instead of merely enjoying results of the easing of tension. This is vitally important at this time the signing of the INF Treaty has to be followed by agreements of a greater scale. Such an agreement will, first of all, include an agreement on a 50% cut of strategical offensive arms under the terms of observance for the ABM treaty. It is also necessary to discontinue nuclear tests and to ban and eliminate chemical weapons.

Needless to say, the Soviet Union and Japan, as nations of the Asia-Pacific region, should show concern about the need to strengthen the foundations of stability in this common region. The Soviet Union already called on all the Asian and Pacific nations, including Japan, to take part in a joint search for ways to ensure regional security and peaceful cooperative activities.

We do not consider ourselves to have a prescription for every case. Nevertheless, we feel that proposals made by General Secretary Gorbachev in his Vladivostok speech and his interview with the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA offer a basis of debate on common interests. [passage omitted]

Soviet-Japanese Trade Expert Analyzes Prospects

Part I

OW190006 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Ivan Oligin commentary; read by announcer]

[Text] Many listeners take interest in Soviet-Japanese trade exchanges. Mr Ivan Oligin, an expert in this field, made the following remarks regarding trade exchanges between the Soviet Union and Japan:

On 6 December, we marked the 30th anniversary of the conclusion of a commerce and navigation treaty between the Soviet Union and Japan. In this 30-year period, the two countries have made great progress in their trade and economic exchanges. The volume of mutual commodity supplies has increased more than 100 times. Currently, trade exceeds R3 billion. Japan has become one of the major Western trade partners of the Soviet Union.

What then has the trade with the Soviet Union been bringing to Japan? For Japan, the Soviet Union has continued to be a constant major supplier of timber—primarily of coniferous trees—and a number of nonferrous metals and rare metals. Coupling pipes, potassic salt, and white lead also constitute big portions of the imports from the Soviet Union. All of these are contributing to Japan's maintaining stable supply of raw materials, thus minimizing Japan's possible losses caused by unstable supplies and price increases by other supplying sources.

On the other hand, imports to the Soviet Union are providing the possibility of Japan improving the situation in her various industries which are bound to face difficult times. These include the steel, chemical and textile industries, which have reliable and large market in the Soviet Union. With Japan's products absorbed in the Soviet market, trade exchanges with the Soviet

Union are also helping Japan lessen trade frictions with her other trade partners. For instance, about 10% of rolled steel materials, plastics, and synthetic rubber products, as well as substantial portions of textile and contruction machinery exported from Japan, are absorbed by the Soviet Union. Also contributing much to the development of trade activities between the Soviet Union and Japan are the joint projects carried out in cooperation with each other to develop natural resources in Siberia and the Far East.

Following the formation of the Economic Cooperation Committee in 1965, economic relations between the Soviet Union and Japan began to have a composite character, with more complicated but stable forms, going beyond simple commercial relations. So far, five large joint projects have been carried out. They are the first, second and third timber agreements, the agreement on the Vostochnyy Port First Phase Project, and the agreement on supply of industrial-purpose (?chips) to Japan.

Now, three more agreements—those concerning development of coal mines in South Yakutsk ASSR and petroleum gas deposits in Sakhalin, and the second agreement on (?chips)—are about to be realized.

I have so far explained various positive factors the two sides have experienced in promoting trade and economic relations, but now I must also touch on major difficulties that started in the early eighties.

Since that time, Soviet-Japanese trade activities began to lose vitality, the trade imbalance started to grow, and the prospects of economic cooperation for developing natural resources in the Siberian Far East have become dim. Naturally, such a situation has resulted from many factors. However, one of the major causes is Japan's approach. It lies in Japan's attempt to create artificial obstacles to the development of mutually benefitial practical exchanges between the two countries.

As is well-known, a certain class in Japan entertains a view that the Soviet Union was more interested in the bilateral practical exchanges than Japan. Judging from the past, and also from the fact that it will be none other than Japanese enterprises which will suffer damage caused by articifial restraints on trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union, it is quite evident that such a view is nothing but a distorted interpretation.

There is only one conclusion: that is, to remove the artificial obstacles and to expand chances of mutual cooperation in pursuit of reciprocal benefits.

Part II

OW201250 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Ivan Oligin commentary; read by announcer]

[Text] You will now hear the second portion of Ivan Oligin's remarks on Soviet-Japanese trade. Ivan Oligin is an expert in this field. Yesterday, you heard about the results of Soviet-Japanese cooperation over the past 30 years. Today you will hear about prospects in bilateral cooperation:

The Soviet Union and Japan are now at a turning point in their trade and economic relations. They either will see these relations remain stalled and further reduced or check the negative trends and give new momentum to the relations. What prospects do the two countries have for further developing and expanding their trade exchanges?

First, cooperation under the compensation formula in [word indistinct] industrial field still appears to have substantial potential. As it has in the past, Japan will require large quantities of fuels and raw materials for industrial purposes, and Japan's imports of Soviet natural resources will certainly accelerate development of bilateral economic relations. There is also ample room for development in trade between coastal cities and cooperative associations. Growth in this area has slowed in recent years, but rapid development in the Soviet Far East and expanded authorities and rights of local enterprises within the framework of economic reform will increase export resources and improve product quality in this area and boost imports of Japanese commodities.

There is still untapped potential in the monetary and credit fields. First, Soviet and Japanese banks should open branches in each other's country and promote exchange through them. Banks on both sides are interested in this issue. Therefore, the Japanese Government should have a progressive position on this question. This is particularly important.

Exploration of new fields and new forms of economic exchange is important. For example, as many advanced capitalist countries do, Japan can purchase more Soviet patents and licenses. CPSU Secretary General Gorbachev said in his Vladivostok speech said that it should be possible to organize long-term cooperation in the survey and development of marine resources and coordinate plans for the peaceful study and use of space.

Another substantial opportunity has emerged with a decree adopted on 13 January concerning foreign participation in joint ventures sited in the Soviet Union. In June the Soviet Union and Japan took the first step by signing an agreement on establishing a Soviet-Japanese joint venture. Soviet agencies concerned are now studying basic data from Japanese firms regarding possible joint ventures in [word indistinct] processing, light industry, and food processing.

Joint activities in third countries, particularly in developing countries, and cooperation in resolving important economic issues in the Asia and Pacific region can develop business exhanges between the Soviet Union and Japan. For example, the two countries can direct their efforts to improving productivity, worker skills,

energy development, and environmental protection. They also can work together for rational use of Pacific mineral and biological resources and measures promoting rescue operations.

When we view the current trade relations between the Soviet Union and Japan, we realize the need to consider their structure from a new point of view. For example, the two countries require higher-level accords or legal documentation, such as a government-to-government agreement on economic and industrial cooperation. The Soviet Union has concluded these accords with many West European countries.

There is also a new possibility, thanks to economic reforms in the Soviet Union, that direct economic exchanges will be carried out between various localities of the two countries, such as Maritime Kray and Hokkaido.

In conclusion, the 30th anniversary of the trade agreement between the Soviet Union and Japan on 6 December provided a good opportunity for reviewing trade between the two countries. The Soviet Union firmly believes that stable development of Soviet-Japanese trade and economic cooperation represents a solid basis for truly goodneighborly relations between the two countries.

You have just listened to remarks made on Soviet-Japanese economic exchanges by Mr Ivan Oligin, an expert in this field.

Reportage on South Korean Elections

Election Results Noted

LD182151 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 18 TASS—Official results of the presidential election held last Wednesday in South Korea, the first one in the past 16 years, have been announced in Seoul. The central electoral commission announced the name of the winner: retired General No Tae-u, candidate of the ruling regime who got 35.9 percent of the votes. Kim Yong-sam, chairman of the Democratic Party for Unification, got 27.5 percent of votes. Kim Tae-Chung, leader of the Party of Peace and Democracy, was the third with 26.5 percent of votes. 7.9 percent of electors voted for Kim Jong-pil, former prime minister of South Korea.

'Unfair' Election Protested

LD182152 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 18 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev reports:

Pak Ki-hwan, South Korea's prominent anti-government opposition activist, has termed as "unacceptable" the victory of General No Tae-u in Wednesday's presidential election.

In a statement distributed today he said that the elections had been "totally unfair."

Two more South Korean opposition leaders—Kim Yong-sam, secretary-general of the Democratic Front for the Reunification of the Fatherland, and Kim Tae-chung, leader of the party for Peace and Democracy—had earlier charged the authorities with rigging the elections.

Pak Ki-hwan ran for presidency as an independent candidate and enjoyed wide support among student organizations opposed to the pro-American regime as well as among the democratically minded intellectuals.

But Pak withdrew from the race two days before the balloting, after the opposition's failure to agree on one candidate to compete against General No who represented the government party.

Pak also said that Kim Yong-sam and Kim Tae-chung were "politically and morally responsible for the failure to end the rule of the military". He called on Korea's democratic forces to unite against the Seoul regime.

Police Storm Voting Center

LD182150 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 18 TASS—More than 4,000 police today stormed a vote-counting centre in Seoul where about 2,000 students and workers were protesting at the rigging of the presidential election held in South Korea Wednesday.

According to reports coming here, the protesters, who seized the building yesterday, hurled stones and pieces of furniture at the police.

Some of them jumped from the roof as the police approached. Several people have been reported injured.

ROK Democracy Seen as Unlikely

OW1910620 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2355 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Vsevolod Solovyev commentary; from the Novosti newscast]

[Text] Last Wednesday, No Tae-u, the ruling party candidate, was assured victory in the presidential elections in South Korea. Preliminary figures show that he is leading his nearest rival Kim Yong-sam, chairman of the Reunification Democratic Party, by nearly 2 million votes.

No Tae-u, speaking at a press conference today, promised to do everything possible to ensure stability and called for a new era of democracy in South Korea. In his turn, Kim Tae-chung, one of the opposition candidates, stressed that the elections were unfair, and placed the full burden of responsibility for this on No Tae-u and Chon Tu-hwan, the present head of the Seoul regime. Our commentary follows:

[Solovyev] Hello Comrades. The final results of the elections have not, as yet, been announced. However, even now, the winner of the first direct presidential elections in South Korea in 16 years is known. He is No Tae-u, a retired general. His candidacy for the presidential position was put forward by the ruling regime. It has been announced that at least 7.6 million voters voted for him.

The leading opposition presidential candidate, Kim Yong-sam, chairman of the Reunification Democratic Party, and Kim Tae-chung, leader of the Peace and Democratic Party, received 5.6 million and 5.4 million votes respectively. As we can see, if the opposition leaders had not acted independently, but presented a unified front, the victory would have undoubtedly been theirs. Surely, if one is to add the votes cast for the two Kims, then the opposition has a decisive advantage over the retired general, but in this instance personal ambitions prevailed.

Now, those who have been defeated are saying that the elections have been unfair. The opposition is maintaining that these elections took place under widespread government interference, and that the regime resorted to all kinds of machinations during the course of the elections. These charges are not without foundation. For its part, the regime is denying all charges, and has stated that it will not tolerate the rejection of the election results. The situation in the country is currently quite tense. Observers agree that opposition protests are likely, though many feel these protests are unlikely to reach the level of mass demand for the resignation of the Government.

The victorious No Tae-u has already held a press conference. He promised that, with his coming to power, the flower of democracy will bloom in the country. However, there are weighty reasons to doubt this, for it was he that Chon Tu-hwan, the present dictator, not 6 months ago, named as his successor.

Rogachev, Kim Il-song Hold Talks in Pyongyang

LD191345 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0705 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Pyongyang, 19 Dec (TASS)—Igor Rogachev, special representative of the Soviet leadership and USSR deputy minister of Foreign Affairs, was received here today by Kim Il-song, general secretary of the KWP [korean Workers Party] Central Committee and DPRK President.

The Korean leader was given detailed information about the Soviet assessment of the results of the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Washington and the accords reached in the course of the talks with the U.S. President.

Kim Il-song said that the KWP Central Committee and the DPRK Government gave a high appraisal and fully approve the signing of the Treaty on Eliminating the Soviet and U.S. Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. We congratulate Gorbachev on the great success of his visit to Washington. The work he did there meets the interests of not just the Soviet peoples, but also of the peoples of the whole world. The Korean peoples, Kim Il-song noted, are particularly interested in reducing nuclear armaments because a great quantity of these weapons are accumulated in Southern Korea. We hope that the Washington accords will exert a positive influence on the situation on the Korean peninsula region.

Views were exchanged on the prospects for disarmament, the settlement of conflict and crisis situations, and on the development of international situation, particularly in the Asian-Pacific Ocean region.

Ho Tam, secretary of the KWP Central Committee, Kang Sok-chu, DPRK deputy minister of Foreign Affairs, and Gennadiy Bartoshevich, USSR ambassador to the DPRK were present at the meeting.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

KGB Head Chebrikov To Visit SRV, Laos

LD200737 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0705 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 20 December (TASS)—V.M. Chebrikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the USSR's KGB, is going on an official friendly visit to the SRV and the Lao People's Democratic Republic at the invitation of the CPV and LPRP Central Committees and of those countries' governments.

Departure Reported

LD201413 Moscow TASS in English 1209 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—Viktor Chebrikov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR State Security Committee, has left today on official friendly visits to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic at the invitation of the Central Committees of the Communist Party of Vietnam and the Lao People's Revolutionary Party and the governments of those countries. [Moscow Television Service in Russian on 20 December at 1530 GMT broadcasts this same report, and adds the following: "He was seen off by Comrade Vorotnikov and other officials."]

Hun Sen Sends Telegram to Prince Sihanouk

LD182058 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Phnom Penh December 18 TASS—Hun Sen Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, has sent a telegram to Norodom Sihanouk, expressing satisfaction with the latter's consent to continue dialogue on the issues of settling the Kampuchean problem.

The Kampuchean head of government informed the prince that their talks could be resumed on January 27, as planned.

Valentinov Discusses Cambodian Settlement

OW182344 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Station Observer Valentinov commentary]

[Excerpts] The Vietnamese Government has expressed its willingness to support and promote the realization of the agreement reached between Cambodian leader Hun Sen and Prince Sihanouk during their recent meeting in France. In this connection, Station Observer Valentinov has the following comments:

In his return trip from France, Hun Sen made a stopover in Hanoi and held talks with Vietnamese leaders. Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, assured Hun Sen, in the name of the Vietnamese Government, that Vietnam would support the plan of letting Khmer people settle their own problems without outside interference. He reiterated that, as agreed upon earlier, the Vietnamese volunteers will gradually withdraw from Cambodia and would completely leave that country in 1990. The last batch of Vietnamese volunteers may leave Cambodia earlier than scheduled if the various Cambodian factions could reach an agreement on ceasing conflict in the near future. [passage omitted]

On the methods of mediation, both Hun Sen and Prince Sihanouk have a common viewpoint, that is, it must be done through peaceful means, with talks by the Cambodian people themselves without interference from outside forces. [passage omitted]

I wish to reiterate that they should refrain from using force and threatening each other with force during the negotiations. The Cambodian Government and Prince Sihanouk both held that the key to success in mediation precisely lies in this point. [passage omitted]

Near East & South Asia

Akhromeyev Arrives in India 21 Dec

LD210639 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0620 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Delhi, 21 December (TASS)—Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, first deputy defense minister of the USSR, arrived in Delhi today on an official visit at the invitation of De. La Fontaine, chairman of the chiefs of staff committee, chief of India's Air Force.

Military Operation Against Afghan Rebels Viewed

LD191719 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by Correspondent M. Leshinskiy]

[Text] A major military operation against armed extremist groups has begun in southeastern Afghanistan.

[Leshchinskiy] These combat actions are aimed at achieving not just military objectives, but political ones as well. They are being carried out against an armed group of the Jadran tribe, whose land borders on Pakistan. It is this area along the Afghan-Pakistan border that is particularly saturated with dushman military and centers for training fighters, and it is from here that the convoy routs begin, along which weapons are delivered right up to the suburbs of Kabul. In addition, the Jadran tribe has cut Khost District off from the country's central areas. This district juts out far into neighboring Pakistan. For 9 years that district's population has been practically held hostage by the counterrevolution. On this aerial photosurvey map you can see those distant peaks. It also indicates the armed groups' fortified areas. As you can see, all of the summits are literally dotted with them. According to intelligence data there are around 9,000 armed bandits concentrated there. There are three lines of defense there, and in the rear the Pakistani border.

On the Afghan side the operation is being led by Lieutenant General Shah Nawaz, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff. Noting that this operation is being conducted under instructions from the central authorities and in full accordance with the principles of national reconciliation in Afghanistan, Gen. Shah Nawaz stressed that the combat actions were preceeded by a greal deal of work to seek peaceful ways of resolving this problem. To all appearances, however, under strong pressure from Pakistan and Western allies, the Jadran tribe rejected all the peace proposals. The blockade of Khost, said the general, will now be lifted by military means.

Soviet Transport Plane Downed

LD191819 Tehran IRNA in English 1812 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Islamabad, Dec. 19, IRNA—A Soviet military transport plane was shot down in Khost Governorate, Paktia Province, southeastern Afghanistan by anti-aircraft fire of Afghan mujahedin on December 15, according to a report by Agency Afghan Press (AAP) here Saturday.

The report said that the downed Soviet plane was carrying ammunition and weapons for the besieged Khost military garrison.

According to latest reports reaching from Paktia, pitched battles between the Mojahedin and the joint Soviet-Afghan Government troops are undeway in the Khost Region with the former smashing several heavy attacks of the joint forces aimed at breaking the siege of Khost town.

Direct Moscow-Kabul Cooperation Develops

LD181641 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—"The hand of Moscow" is the hand of a friend aspiring to support the Afghan people in building a new life. It is by these feelings that Muscovites were motivated in shipping to Kabul the first consignment of cargoes as part of the disinterested aid in developing the municipal economy of the Afghan capital.

Five railway platforms loaded with buses and trucks of various designation have been dispatched there today. Some time earlier eight containers with equipment for construction have been sent there. A new consignment of equipment for an outpatient clinic and a boarding school is being prepared for shipping.

These supplies are done within the framework of the agreement on cooperation between the capitals of the two countries—the city committees of the CPSU and the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the city councils, the trade union and youth organizations and a number of work collectives in Moscow and Kabul signed in September. The agreement is the foundation of the direct ties between the two capitals raising it to an even higher level.

The partners of the Kabul friends are work collectives of builders, transport workers and personnel of other organizations. Many problems are to be resolved by joint efforts. Thus in particular, Moscow architects propose assistance in forming the landscape and green zone of Kabul, improving its amenities. Within the Framework of the cultural programme it is planned to give assistance in organizing the activities of theatres, in arranging for rest and recreation of Kabul children.

Considerable changes in Kabul's development are linked as before with the operation of the house building complex, which was put up in 1965 in Kabul as the Soviet Government's gift. Due to it new residential neighbourhoods complete with a complex of engineering facilities, shops, schools, kindergartens and other everyday service facilities have been put up. Now the complex is under reconstruction. Upon completion of all work its output capacity will be increased to reach 100,000 square metres of housing a year.

Jordanian King Husayn's USSR Visit Previewed

PM201745 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 87 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed article: "Regarding the Visit to the Soviet Union by Husyan ibn Talal, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan"]

[Text] King Husayn ibn Talal of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan arrives in the Soviet Union on 21 December on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government.

King Husayn was born in 1935. He received his education in Amman and Alexandria (Egypt) and then graduated from the military academy at Sandhurst in England. He ascended the throne in 1952.

King Husayn ibn Talal is a prominent Arab statesman and an advocate of the strengthening of the Arab countries' unity.

In November this year a conference of the heads of Arab states was held in Amman. King Husayn was one of the organizers of this conference.

Jordan advocates the consolidation of world peace and the security of the peoples, the establishment of a new international economic order, and the convening of an international conference on the Near East for the purpose of achieving an all-embracing just settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Jordan consistently pursues a line of developing friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. Jordan's leadership rates highly the large-scale Soviet initiatives aimed at the creation of a nonnuclear and nonviolent world, and it comes out in favor of the necessity for the active participation of the Soviet Union in the process of a Near East settlement. After the establishment of diplomatic relations in August 1963, the Soviet Union and Jordan signed a series of agreements on the basis of which Soviet-jordanian economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation is being effected.

King Husayn has made several official visits to the Soviet Union.

Soviet people welcome the arrival in our country of the eminent Jordanian guest and express confidence that the Soviet leaders' forthcoming meetings and talks with King Husayn will serve the further development of relations of friendship and fruitful cooperation between the USSR and Jordan and that they will contribute to the formation of a new climate in international relations and also to the matter of establishing a lasting peace in the Near East taking into account the interests of all states and peoples of this region.

Sytenko Tells Algerian Officials of INF Treaty

LD192226 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1849 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Excerpt] Algiers, 19 Dec (TASS)—The special representative of the Soviet leadership, Mikhail Sytenko who is here on a visit, today met Rabah Bitat, speaker of the National People's Assembly of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic and Mohamed Aberkane, deputy minister of foreign affairs.

He informed the Algerian side in detail about the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit and the treaty concluded in Washington on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, and also about the further areas of work for reducing strategic offensive weapons by 50% and about other matters which came up during the talks. [passage omitted]

Morocco, USSR To Step Up Cultural Cooperation

LD182316 Rabat MAP in English 1217 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 18 (MAP)—Morocco and the Soviet Union have decided to reinforce their cultural cooperation through a series of concrete actions, mainly the exchange of experts and artists.

In a final communique, released Thursday [17 December] in Moscow at the end of talks between visiting Moroccan minister of Cultural Affairs and his Soviet counterpart V.G. Zakharov, the two sides decided that Morocco will participate next year in the Moscow international popular arts festival while the Soviet Union will participate, with the Bolchoi Ballet and the "Russkie Uzory" popular troops, in the Azilah Festival next summer.

The two sides will also exchange experts in public libraries and museums and organize book and art exhibitions in both capitals.

An agreement protocol is to be concluded soon, they decided, providing for more extensive cultural cooperation between the two countries.

Earlier on Thursday, Benaissa had attended a series of lectures at the seat of the Union of Soviet Associations for Friendship and Cultural Cooperation with Foreign Countries. He also inaugurated, along with Soviet Vice-minister of Cultural Affairs M. Gribanov, an exhibition of paintings by some 40 Moroccan artists. Benaissa has extended, on the, occasion, an invitation to Zakharov to pay a visit to Morocco which he accepted.

TASS Notes Israel's 'Crimes' Against Palestians

LD192021 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Msocow December 19 TASS—Follows full text of a TASS statement:

Israel, persisting in its policy of keeping the occupied Arab territories by force, has again, for the umpteenth time, launched massive repressive actions against civilian Palestinian population.

Ever new reports are coming in from Gaza sector and the West Bank of the Jordan on crimes being perpetrated by the invaders. Almost full-scale combat operations involving tanks and helicopters were launched. As a result, there are tens of killed and hundreds of injured. Even hospitals were attacked: There are casualties among patients and the attending personnel.

An explosive situation also keeps on in Lebanon's south where Israel, flagrantly trampling upon the norms of international law, occupies part of sovereign Lebanese territory. The Israeli military are making preparations which cannot be regarded otherwise than a preparation for a new aggressive attack against the Arabs.

The escalation of violence against the Palestinians coincides with the signing of the U.S.-Israeli "Memorandum of Understanding" which in the field of military cooepration granted Israel the status which is equal to that of the USA's NATO allies. This cannot but encourage the adventuristic policy of the Tel Aviv Hawks.

The glaring violations of the human rights by the occupiers and their overt disregard for the 1949 Geneva convention give rise to the international community's indignation. Quite recently the United Nations General Assembly qualified Israel's actions in the occupied territories as war crimes and an affront to mankind.

At the current special meetings of the U.N. Security Council, representatives of many countries firmly denounced Israel's repressive actions.

The criminal actions against civilian population in the occupied Arab territories are being strongly condemned in the Soviet Union, and solidarity with the just struggle of the Palestinian people against occupation and for their inalienable national rights is being expressed.

The developments in the occupied territories indicate that the Middle East conflict remains one of the acutest problems which require a solution without delay.

The way to a just and lasting peace in the region lies through the convocation of an international conference under U.N. auspices with the participation of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and all parties directly concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization—the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

Recently a overwhelming majority of states at the 42nd Session of the General Assembly again declared for the convocation of such a conference.

It is time the leading circles of Tel Aviv heeded this voice of reason.

'Memorandum' Prompts Repression

LD201720 Moscow TASS in English 1537 GMT 20 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—TASS news analyst Sergey Fyodorov writes:

It is far from being accidental that yet another escalation of the Zionist violence against the Palestinians coincided with the signing of the U.S.-Israeli "Memorandum of Understanding".

Tel Aviv decided not without reason: Since Washington equated Israel in the field of military cooperation with its closest NATO allies, the U.S. Administration would not prevent it from using firearms against civilians in the occupied Arab territories.

And, one should say, Tel Aviv was not wrong! The occupation troops launched most veritable combat operations involving tanks and helicopters against local population in Gaza sector and in the West Bank of the Jordan.

Mosques have been desecrated, scores of innocent people killed and hundreds wounded.

In the Arab world, there are mounting demands for restraining the terrorist regime of Tel Aviv which has embarked upon the road of genocide. Many countries have condemned the Israeli repressive actions. Even in Tel Aviv itself demonstrations involving not only Arabs but Jews as well were held in a demand for an end to the violence and for the establishment of a Palestinian state.

One cannot but mention Washington among those who keep silent. Those, who are fond of posing as "upholders" of human rights and of looking for human rights "violations" where there is not a trace of them, keep tight-lipped. They regard with obvious "understanding" the annexationist policy of Tel Aviv which seeks to deprive the entire Palestinian people of human rights.

But the Palestinians have not put up with the fate prepared for them by the Israeli occupiers and their U.S. patrons. The French "LIBERATION" newspaper writes that Gaza sector and the West Bank of the Jordan have not known such an intensity of struggle over the entire twenty years of occupation. The British "SUNDAY TIMES" admits that these are history's largest-scale activities of the Palestinians.

East Jerusalem is also the focus of unrest which has spread over to the territories which israel occupied prior to the war of 1967. Local Arab leaders have called on all Arabs who live in Israel to go on a general strike on monday, December 21, in protest against the occupiers' terror.

"The indigenous population's action in the occupied Arab territories, the action which has developed into an uprising, has by no means reached its peak", warned George Habash, general secretary of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP).

"Our people cannot tolerate any longer the 20-year-long humiliation, oppression, and repressive actions on the part of the Zionists. Our legitimate rights is to fight for our own liberation."

Can the escalation of bloodshed be stopped? It was emphasized at the recent all-Arab summit in Amman, peace in the middle East could be achieved only as a result of termination of the Israeli occupation, restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, and of a solution to the Palestinian question in all its aspects.

East Europe

PRAVDA Profiles New CPCZ Leader Jakes

PM210847 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed article: "Milos Jakes, General Secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee"]

[Text] Milos Jakes was born 12 August 1922 into a poor peasant family in the hamlet of Ceske Chaloupy in the Cesky Krumlov region. After graduating from secondary school he became an electrician and then worked as an erector and later as a designer at the "Svit" enterprise in Gottwaldov. After part-time study he graduated from a higher industrial school.

Soon after Czechoslovakia's liberation by the Soviet Army in June 1945 he joined the ranks of the CPCZ. He fulfilled party assignments at the "Svit" enterprise. He was a member of the CPCZ regional committee and kraj committee in Gottwaldov. He took an active part in the work of the youth organization and was first secretary of the Czechoslovak Youth Union regional committee and kraj committee and a member of the Czechoslovak Youth Union Central Committee Presidium.

He held various posts on national committees and in 1950 was elected chairman of the Unified National Committee in Gottwaldov, where he worked until 1952. He took an active part in socialist transformations in the countryside. Then he was elected secretary of the Czechoslovak Youth Union Central Committee. In 1955 he went to Moscow to study at the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School, and after graduating from there in 1958 he was confirmed as a CPCZ Central Committee sector chief. In 1961 he was appointed leader of the Central Administration of National Committee Affairs. From 1963 he worked as first deputy chairman of the Central Administration for Local Economic Development. During 1966-1968 he was CSSR deputy minister of the interior for civilian administrative questions.

In March 1968 he was elected chairman of the CPCZ Central Control and Audit Commission, of which he had been a member since 1966. During the period of the open offensive by antisocialist and counterrevolutionary forces, M. Jakes resolutely defended the interests of the party and the people and took an active part in overcoming the crisis in the party and society and in resolving the problems that had accumulated earlier.

From 1977 he was a member of the CPCZ Central Committee, candidate member of the Presidium, and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. In that post he tackled questions of party leadership of agriculture and the food industry. From 1981 he was a member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and chairman of the CPCZ Central Committee National Economic Commission. From 1971 he was a deputy of the Chamber of People [narodnaya palata], and from 1981 a member of the CSSR Federal Assembly Presidium.

In responsible party, state, and public posts M. Jakes makes a considerable contribution to the cause of building socialism, strengthening the friendship of Czechoslovakia's fraternal peoples, deepening socialist economic integration, and developing cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

He is a hero of socialist labor of the CSSR and has received many Czechoslovak awards. In 1982 he was awarded the Order of the October Revolution.

Gorbachev Congratulations

PM210845 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Undated Gorbachev message congratulating M. Jakes on election as CPCZ Central Committee general secretary]

[Text] To Comrade Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee

Dear Comrade Jakes!

Accept cordial congratulations on your election as general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

We are confident that under your leadership the Central Committee will ensure the realization of the large-scale tasks facing the party in further developing and renewing socialism on Czechoslovak soil, restructuring the economic mechanism, and democratizing the country's sociopolitical life and of the 17th CPCZ Congress decisions aimed at accelerating the CSSR's socioeconomic development.

People in our party and country know you, Comrade Jakes, as a principled Communist, an active champion of close cooperation with the Soviet Union, and a sincere friend of our country. We are profoundly convinced that the fraternal alliance of the CPSU and the CPCZ will continue to be a reliable guarantee of unbreakable friendship between our countries and peoples.

I wish you, Dear Comrade Jakes, great successes in your new responsible post.

With Communist greetings,

M. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Jakes Thanks Gorbachev

LD211624 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 21 Dec (TASS)—Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, has sent Mikhail Gorbachev a telegram expressing thanks for the congratulations on occasion of his election as general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

"The 17th CPCZ Congress drafted a wide-ranging and complex program of further development and strengthening of socialism in our country, and of acceleration of socioeconomic development in indissoluble connection with restructuring and democratization of the whole of public life", the telegram says. "These are similar issues and tasks to those which are being tackled by all socialist countries, proceeding from their own conditions. The work of the fraternal CPSU acts as a powerful stimulus and a fruitful, inspiring example for them in this".

"We shall do all we can in order that the friendship and cooperation of our communist parties and countries continue to be deepened", the telegram stresses.

LCY Organ Ponders Operation of Press Freedom

PM181447 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "KOMUNIST on Yugoslav Press Articles"]

[Text] Belgrade, 17 Dec—"Great Deeds and Petty Speculations"—under this title the weekly KOMUNIST, organ of the LCY, published an article by A. Sekulovic. It raises the question of the way certain Yugoslav newspapers assess major international events. The article states: It is not news that we live in strange times, when many values are turned upside down, criteria are distorted, judgments are turned inside out, and confusion reigns in thoughts and ideology. There is nothing unusual in the fact that in such a situation petty speculations take place, insignificant questions and various stupidities are placed on a pedestal, erroneous judgments both of people and of events appear, or judgments are expressed by fortuitous and incompetent persons.

Naturally, all this applies also to the treatment of international events in the Yugoslav mass media. There are plenty of examples of such quirks, but the recent attempts to discredit the then imminent signing of the treaty between the United States and the USSR on the reduction of missile arms, which is welcomed by the entire international peace-loving public, represent a real rarity.

Thus, a certain commentator in BORBA's Sunday edition tried to sow the doubt that we are talking about a new Yalta from which the world cannot, of course, expect anything good. In the newspaper VJESNIK another commentator—who should be named: Kresimir Fijacko—tried to foist onto readers his own idea of politics as a big gaming house where it is a question only of who will outwit and deceive whom.

It is not worth polemizing with such views. The efforts made by the United States and the USSR and, in particular, by M.S. Gorbachev personally to achieve the signing of that historic treaty have won universal recognition all over the world and do not need defending against people of this sort. But we are doing this for our own sake, and this is why we ask: Does freedom of the press imply also the readers' right to be protected against the personal inferences and dreams of journalists, or must they suffer them ad infinitum?

Briefs

Trade With GDR

An intergovernmental protocol on trade between the USSR and the GDR for next year has been signed in Moscow. It provides for the further development of mutually beneficial trade. The GDR will continue to occupy a leading place in the foreign trade of the Soviet Union, and the USSR will remain the GDR's main trading partner. Our country's deliveries to the GDR include metal-machining equipment; microelectronic manufactured items; walking excavators; tower cranes; road-building vehicles; tractor; trucks and cars; and aviation technology. On the basis of long-term commitments, there are plans for deliveries of substantial quantities of the main kinds of energy carriers and raw materials. We shall receive from the GDR products that are needed for the development of the basic sectors of home industry and the agro-industrial complex, as well as for the implementation of the consumer goods production program. [Text] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0130 GMT 12 Dec 87 LD*]

Trade With Romania

An intergovernmental protocol on goods exchanges between the USSR and Romania in 1988 has been signed in Moscow. The protocol creates conditions for further improving trade and economic relations in line with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 13th RCP Congress and also the results of accords reached during talks between the leaders of the two countries. During preparations of the protocol the sides examined issues connected with implementation of the comprehensive program for the scientific-technological progress of the CEMA countries to the year 2000. The protocol that has been signed reflects for the first time the obligations of the sides in the area of direct production ties. The protocol was signed by Aristov, USSR minister of foreign trade, and Vaduva, Romanian minister of foreign trade and international economic cooperation. [Text] [*Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 12 Dec 87 LD*]

West Europe

USSR, Netherlands Agree on INF Inspections

LD182257 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] In the Hague, the Dutch Foreign Ministry and the Soviet Embassy have exchanged notes that represent an agreement between the two governments on inspections in the Netherlands, envisaged by the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The Soviet-Dutch agreement will come into force together with the Soviet-American treaty and remain in operation for 13 years.

France's Mitterrand Praises INF Accord

LD181328 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Paris December 18 TASS—The Soviet-American treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is an event which will go down into history and has signalled the start of the process of true strengthening of peace, President Francois Mitterrand of France said in an

interview published in LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR weekly. The president voiced hope that the Soviet Union and the USA would continue following the path of disarmament. In his words, accord should be sought towards a 50 per cent cut in the strategic arsenals and drawing up an agreement on the observance of the ABM Treaty.

Simultaneously Mitterrand again declared for nuclear deterrence strategy and put forward a whole number of terms for France's joining in disarmament, from which it follows that Paris does not intend so far to make a real contribution to that process. He declared in favour of continuing the French-West German military cooperation, yet excluded the spreading of the French "nuclear umbrella" to the FRG.

Norwegian Foreign Minister Briefed on Summit
LD182122 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1557 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Excerpt] Oslo, 18 Dec (TASS)—Nikolay Uspenskiy, chief of the Second European Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who arrived in Norway today as a special representative of the Soviet leadership, met Thorvald Stoltenberg, Norwegian foreign minister, and other responsible staffers of the Foreign Ministry.

The Soviet diplomat informed the representatives of Norway in detail about the results of the summit meeting which took place between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, in Washington from 7-11 December. [passage omitted]

Finland's Koivisto Meets With Aganbegyan
LD190006 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Helsinki, 18 Dec (TASS)—Mauno Koivisto, president of the Republic of Finland, today received Academician Abel Aganbegyan, who is in the country through the auspices of the All-Union Copyright Agency in connection with the publication in Finnish of his book "A New and Better Soviet Union." The book deals with the processes of restructuring Soviet society's socioeconomic life.

In the course of their conversation, they discussed specific issues regarding implementation of economic transformations in the USSR. It was also noted that the transformations are evoking great interest in broad public circles throughout the world, including Finland.

Losev Holds Bonn Talks on Cooperation
LD191305 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1755 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Bonn, 18 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondents Gennadiy Kulbitskiy and Vladimir Serov report:

A conversation took place today at the West German Foreign Ministry between a visiting Soviet delegation and Dr Kastrup, head of the FRG Foreign Ministry's subdepartment for Eastern Europe. The Soviet delegation, which has been taking part in a Soviet-West German colloquim in Salzgitter, is led by Sergey Losev, president of the USSR-FRG Society and general director of TASS. They exchanged views on the state of and prospects for relations between the USSR and the FRG, particularly on the development of economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the two countries, which was the main topic of the colloquium.

The head of the Soviet delegation, who had witnessed the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, stressed that that meeting was the first step along the path of genuine disarmament and promoted an improvement in the whole international situation. It should also give a stimulus to development of Soviet-West German relations in all areas, especially the economic and scientific-technical spheres. He pointed out that this is the precise area in which the USSR-FRG Society and the Federation of FRG-USSR Societies are facing new and important tasks. Both societies are called upon to promote establishment of links between representatives of the business world of the two countries and, in particular, to promote the setting up of joint Soviet-West German enterprises.

Touching on trade and economic relations between the USSR and the FRG, Sergey Losev noted that the restrictions on trade with socialist countries that had been introduced by the Western countries, are a considerable obstacle to development of these relations. He called on the FRG to help remove these artificial barriers. He pointed out the first positive experience of setting up Soviet-West German joint enterprises. The FRG occupies the leading place among Western countries in this area.

The FRG Foreign Ministry representative noted the importance of further deepening of Soviet-West German relations, and gave the assurance that the FRG Foreign Ministry is prepared to provide support for the activity of the Federation of FRG-USSR Societies. He referred to the statement by FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl that for the FRG, relations with the USSR are of central importance.

Speaking of the prospects for these relations, Dr Kastrup stressed that it is necessary to pay attention not only to development of trade, but also to seek out new forms such as industrial coproduction and the setting up of joint enterprises. In his opinion, the time has come to give a positive answer to the question of opening a West German cultural institute in the USSR, to give more attention to the reciprocal provision of information about life in the two countries, and in particular to put into practice the holding of telebridges, including some with the participation of FRG and Soviet parliamentarians.

The Soviet delegation met today with representatives of the leading mass media of the FRG. During the conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, the West German journalists displayed a sincere interest in large-scale transformations taking place in the USSR and came out for development of cooperation between the USSR and the FRG in various areas.

Spanish Communist Party Delegation Visits USSR

LD210508 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 20 December (TASS)—In accordance with the plan for ties between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Spain [PCE], a PCE delegation, headed by Francisco Frutos, secretary for social and economic questions of the party Central Committee, was in the Soviet Union from 12 to 20 December. The delegation familiarized itself with the experience of the CPSU's work in restructuring. The Spanish comrades were received in the organizational party work department and the international department of the CPSU Central Committee. They also had talks in the institute of social sciences at the CPSU Central Committee. The delegation made a trip to the Ukrainian SSR and was received in the Kiev oblast committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, in the Ukrainian republican trade unions council, and visited an industrial enterprise and a state farm. In addition, they became acquainted with the activity of party organizations. The Spanish comrades showed great interest in the course of restructuring underway in the political, economic, social, and other spheres of life in Soviet society and in the CPSU's innovative approach to international affairs. They stressed that all this promotes the growth of influence of the ideas of socialism throughout the world.

Loginov Meets With Cypriot Foreign Minister

LD200501 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Nicosia December 19 TASS—Vadim Loginov, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, a special envoy of the Soviet leadership, visiting here, met with Yeoryios Iakovou, minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Cyprus, today.

He informed the Cyprus side of the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Washington and of the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

Vadim Loginov had a talk with Vasos Lissaridhis, president of the House of Representatives, and with Ezekias Papaioannou, general secretary of the Progressive Party of the Working People—Cyprus (Akel).

On the same day Vadim Loginov and Andreas Mavrommatis, general director of the Republic's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, signed a programme for cultural and scientific cooperation between the two countries. The programme envisages wide exchanges of delegations and information in the fields of science, culture and tourism.

[Words indistinct] the document, Andreas Mavrommatis emphasised its importance in further strengthening friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

Briefs

Telephone Accord With Spain

A few minutes ago Luis Solana, president of Telefonica; Antonio Lopez, president of Amper; and Erlen Pervyshin, Soviet minister of communications equipment industry, signed in Moscow a document on creating the first Hispano-Soviet mixed company. In this company, which will make telephones, Amper has a 45% share and Telefonica, 4%; 51% belongs to the Soviet state. The total investment is 1.1 billion pesetas. The planned annual production is 500,000 telephones for the Soviet market, with a small proportion for export. [Excerpt] [*Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1230 GMT 18 Dec 87 LD*]FBIS-SOV-87-244 21 December 1987

Latin America & Caribbean

Arce on U.S. Efforts To 'Stymie' Peace Plan

LD201051 Moscow TASS in English 0803 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Text] Managua December 20 TASS—The Reagan administration makes attempts to stymie the efforts by Latin American peoples to settle the situation in the region under peace agreements signed by the heads of state in August, 1987 in Guatemala, Bayardo Arce, deputy coordinator of the Executive Commission of the Sandinist National Liberation Front National leadership, said in an interview with the newspaper "BARRICADA".

The United States, he said, intended to sabotage the process to bring peace to Central America back before the signing of the agreements by putting forward Reagan's so-called peace plan. Now, the Washington administration [words indistinct] to deal a mortal blow at the accords by forcing Congress to approve 270 million dollars in aid to the mercenary gangs of Somoza followers. The member of the National leaders of the Sandinist National Liberation Front emphasized that the United States was putting pressure on the Sandinist leadership to wrest political concessions from it, which would actually mean a defeat of the Sandinist Revolution. To this end, the administration employs right-wing forces inside Nicaragua, which oppose the government's actions to achieve national reconciliation and implement the Guatemalan accords. Foreign and domestic reaction is out to crush the revolution Chilean-style. The theory of Nicaragua's "Chilization" is to put together civilian opposition and armed counter-revolution, which

makes it easier for the United States to carry through its plans to head off the revolutionary process. However, our people are armed and will defend the revolutionary gains in the event of the attempts to overthrow the popular power, Arce said.

The U.S. attempts to thwart the process of settlement in the region notwithstanding, the Guatemalan arrangements had a large positive effect. Tension has been considerably eased and positive changes shaped up in many countries. Nicaragua is ahead of other states in putting into effect the agreements since we are interested in their implementation. However, for the settlement process to be a success, it is necessary that other countries too scrupulously abide by the items of the accords, Arce stressed.

Anti-Somozist Tribunal To Try Denby
LD171558 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Managua December 17 TASS—U.S. national James Jordan Denby, detained in Nicaragua, met Wednesday with his relatives who had come from the United States.

Denby intruded into Nicaragua's air space last week on a private plane and was shot down by anti-aircraft forces.

Newsmen have not been allowed to interview him as the investigation is not yet completed.

According to a spokesman for the Nicaraguan Ministry of the Interior, Denby's case will be turned over to an anti-Somozista national tribunal one of these days.

He said documents confirming Denby's anti-Sandinist activities and his connections with counter-revolutionaries would be presented at a press conference to be held in a few days.

Salvadoran 'Guerrilla' Leader Cited on Successes
LD181055 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Havana December 17 TASS—The plans worked out by U.S. military advisers for doing away with the armed revolutionary movement in El Salvador have ended in utter failure. The Army of the Salvadorean puppet regime had to assume the defensive practically on the entire territory of the country, Venancio Salvaterra, member of the leadership of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMNLF), has said in an interview with SALPRESS-NOTISAL news agency.

"From January to November of the current year", the guerrilla leader pointed out, "the punitive Army lost 7,180 soldiers, i.e., a seventh of its aggregate strength. Besides, the Duarte regime encounters the problems of desertion and utter loss of morale in the Army. Incessant defeats on the battlefield gave rise to serious differences among the miliatry high-ups".

"The military superiority of FMNLF detachments over the Army of the pro-American regime", Venancio Salvaterra emphasised, "raises the patriots' prestige in the political arena as well and is an evidence of their strength and influence in the country. This, in its turn, creates prerequisites for resumption of the peaceful dialogue (the dialogue was frustrated through the fault of the Duarte regime) between the regime and patriotic organizations with a view to achieving a just peace in El Salvador, as is provided for by the Guatemala agreements".

Komplektov Holds Brasilia Talks on Summit, Ties
LD191236 Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Brasilia December 19 TASS—A meeting between Viktor Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister and special representative of the Soviet leadership, and P. Tarso Flecha de Lima, acting foreign minister of Brazil, took place in the city of Brasilia on Friday.

During a detailed and constructive exchange of opinions the deputy minister set out appraisals by the Soviet side of the results of negotiations between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan on key questions of international politics and pointed to the historic importance of signing the Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate-and Shorter-Range Missiles to tackle a broad range of issues on arms limitation and disarmament and to improve the general international atmosphere.

On behalf of the Brazilian leadership the acting minister pointed to the concurrence of appraisals of the results of the above talks and their positive influence on the situation in the world. He also expressed Brazil's intention to contribute (in cooperation with other countries as well) to a settlement of pressing international questions. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the favourable development of Soviet-Brazilian relations, expansion and deepening of cooperation between the two countries.

Soviet Envoy Briefs Mexico's Sepulveda on Summit
LD181314 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Mexico City December 18 TASS—Viktor Komplektov, special envoy of the Soviet leadership, USSR deputy foreign minister, was received by Mexican secretary of foreign affairs Bernardo Sepulveda. The Mexican foreign secretary was briefed on the assessment by the Soviet side of the outcome of the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Washington and the agreements reached in the course of the talks with the U.S. President. It was

stressed tha the Soviet Union intends to continue pursuing consistently and vigorously the policy towards further practical measures of nuclear disarmament, limitation of other types of weapons, a just political settlement of the regional conflicts and development of mutually beneficial international cooperation. The significance was specially singled out of continuing and building up efforts by all states in the said areas.

Bernardo Sepulveda spoke highly of this gesture of the Soviet leadership, which is evidence of the friendly character of Soviet-Mexican relations. The Mexican side welcomed the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and in the spirit of active and positive foreign policy characteristic of Mexico explicitly declared in favour of even more radical measures to reduce the danger of war, ease international tensions and build up confidence and cooperation among nations.

Shevardnadze Receives Bolivian Ambassador
LD191432 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, has received today Bolivia's Ambassador to the USSR Mario Velarde at his request.

The discussions covered questions raised by the ambassador of Soviet-Bolivian relations as well as topical international issues, above all in the light of the recent Soviet-American summit talks in Washington.

When the conversation touched upon the subject of settlement of regional conflicts, Eduard Shevardnadze drew the ambassador's attention, in particular, to the attempts at a clearly one-sided interpretation by representatives of the U.S. Administration of the content of the conversations between the leaders of the USSR and the USA on Central America. An attempt is being made to picture things as if the Soviet Union has committed itself to cut military aid to Nicaragua, and as far as the United States is concerned, the latter "welcomes" that.

in real fact, the Soviet foreign minister said, Mikhail Gorbachev raised the question of a need for a political settlement of the situation in Central America and the assistance by the USSR and the USA towards the new hopeful processes currently under way in that region, proposed that a joint statement be made in support of the Guatemala accords and the peace-making activity by the Contadora Group. The U.S. President was also proposed that our two countries should take practical measures in that connection. It was said in specific terms that the USSR and the USA should make mutual commitments on a sharp cut in arms supplies to the Central American countries.

Thus the Soviet proposal concerned a mutual Soviet-American commitment and was to be applied to the whole of Central America. Such is the real state of things, Eduard Shevardnadze stressed, and we hope that the U.S. Administration will examine this proposal put forward by us in a constructive spirit, since it accords with the interests of all, above all the Central American nations themselves.

Political & Social

Gromyko on INF Treaty at Supreme Soviet Session

LD181444 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 18 Dec 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium took place in the Kremlin today. Comrade Gromyko delivered a statement containing a high appraisal of the results of the official visit to Washington by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and of the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium unanimously expressed deep satisfaction with the results of the visit and with the signing of the treaty. The question of ratification of the treaty will be examined at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in keeping with established legislative procedures.

The session also examined certain other issues of state life. Comrade Gorbachev, Shcherbitskiy, and Demichev participated in the discussion of the questions on the agenda.

TASS Report on Meeting

LD181458 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 1

["Session of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium was held in the Kremlin today.

Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, made a statement containing a high appraisal of the results of the official visit to Washington by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, his talks with U.S. President Ronald Reagan, and the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium unanimously expressed profound satisfaction at the results of the visit and the signing of the treaty.

The talks that took place and the clear statements and conversations, permeated with conviction, of Mikhail Gorbachev during official engagements and meetings in Washington with figures of state, with the Congress leadership, representatives of business circles, scientific and cultural figures, and the mass media riveted the attention of the whole world.

The Soviet-U.S. treaty evoked particular satisfaction and the broadest possible reaction. Mankind justly sees it as the start of real disarmament, leading ultimately to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the abolition of the threat of nuclear war.

At all stages of elaboration of the treaty persistent efforts were needed to resolve many extremely complex matters. These efforts, particularly at the final stage, produced a major result. The Soviet people have grounds for pride in the outcome and rightly consider the visit and the signing of the treaty as events of historic importance.

The question of ratification of the treaty in accordance with established legislative procedures will be considered at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Then the question of the work of Cherkassy Oblast Soviets of People's Deputies in implementing the USSR Law "On Individual Labor Activity" and developing cooperatives was discussed. V.N. Shapoval, chairman of the Charkassy Oblispolkom, delivered a report. V.G. Nikonchuk, member of the Soviet of the Union Communal Housing and Municipal Economy Commission, delivered a report on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies studying the state of affairs in the localities.

The following took part in the discussion of the question: USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Deputy Chairmen V.S. Shevchenko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and A.F. Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and also I.I. Glad, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Labor and Social Questions.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium examined the question of the work of the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy in strengthening cooperation between subordinate enterprises and organizations and soviets of people's deputies in boosting production efficiency and satisfying more fully working people's social needs. A report by L.V. Kozlov, USSR first deputy minister of nonferrous metallurgy, was heard. Ye.V. Kachalovskiy, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Industry Commission and first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers, delivered a supplementary report from the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' industry commissions.

The following spoke in the debate: S.M. Mukashev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; R.N. Stakheyev, team leader at the "Nagornaya" Mine of the "Gidrougol" Production Association in Kemorovo Oblast and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Resolutions were adopted on the questions discussed which will be published in the press.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium also considered certain other matters of state life.

The session considered the results of the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet in 1987 and approved the plan of fundamental measures planned for the USSR Supreme Soviet in 1988.

Mikhail Gorbachev, Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, and Petr Demichev took part in discussion of the items on the agenda.

Gorbachev, Chebrikov at State Security Celebration
LD181603 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—A celebration meeting devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Soviet state security organs was held in Moscow today.

Present in the Presidium were General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoly Lukyanov, senior officials of a number of ministries and departments, representatives of party, soviet and public organizations.

A speech at the meeting was made by chairman of the State Security Committee of the USSR Viktor Chebrikov.

Zaykov, Ligachev Visit Moscow Food Shops
LD192311 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast—TASS report]

[Text] Union and autonomous republics, krays and oblasts have opened 45 food shops in Moscow this year; 25 of them operate cafes, confectionery and culinary sections for the production of traditional national food products. Cooperative shops have marketed dozens of tons of meat and sausages, fruits and vegetable produce, potatoes, gourds, grapes, honey, mushrooms, wild berries, dried fruit, and other produce. Muscovites and guests in the capital note with gratitude the shops of the consumer coooeratives of the Georgian, Tatar, and Chechen-Ingush Republics and of the Astrakhan, Rostov, Poltava, and Cherkassy oblast unions of consumer cooperatives.

On the instructions of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, matters relating to providing the population of Moscow with foodstuffs were examined the other day. Comrades Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Ligachev, and Slyunkov familiarized themselves with the organization of cooperative trade in the city. Together with the leaders of republics, krays and oblasts, they visited several consumer cooperative shops.

During the visit in conversations with shoppers and shop staff, and at a conference held subsequently at the CPSU Central Committee, certain shortcomings in this important work were exposed. Primarily, a number of unions of consumer cooperatives which have their own shops in Moscow have not ensured a steady supply of products from local resources. Cooperative shops need daily care and control by the rayon party committees and rayon soviet executive committees of Moscow. Some enterprises do not have sufficient commercial refrigeration equipment or warehouse space.

The conference also examined matters connected with holding fairs on the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee in Moscow for marketing agricultural and food products. They enjoy popularity with Muscovites. Various commodities valued at more than R200 million will be marketed at the fairs this year. Collective and state farms and consumer cooperative organizations of the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Turkmenia, Azerbayjan, and Moldavia take an active part in the fairs. The local organ of republics, krays, and oblasts, and also of Moscow and the Central Union of Consumer Cooperatives have been set specific tasks for the organized holding of a new Year's fair.

In reviewing the work of cooperative shops and fairs at the conference, Comrade Ligachev stressed that matters relating to the capital's food supplies occupy an important place in the work of the CPSU Central Committee, and must constantly be watched by both local and Moscow city and rayon party and soviet organs.

Zaykov, Solovyev Attend Local Committee Plenum
LD192330 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Zelenograd CPSU Raykom plenum was held in Moscow today. Comrade Zaykov addressed it. Stressing that the party, the country, and the whole of Soviet society have entered a new and even more complex and crucial stage of the restructuring, he dwelled in detail on fundamental matters relating to party restructuring.

Participants in the Leningrad Party Obkom plenum today also discussed work in leading the restructuring. Comrade Solovyev delivered a report.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee plenum today examined the tasks of the republic's party, local soviet, and economic bodies in transferring enterprises to work in conditions of complete financial autonomy and self-financing beginning in 1988.

Zaykov on INF Treaty

LD191646 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] A member of the Political Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party, Lev Zaykov, has noted achievements of the current policy of perestroyka, or restructuring, in the USSR. Saykov, heading the Moscow organization of the Communist Party, was speaking at a meeting in one of the city's districts. He said that the main thrust of perestroyka was now further democratization of the life of society and a radical economic reform. He said the situation was notably changing for the better. The people are becoming more upright and are openly discussing what is in the way of a better life and work. At that, they didn't gloat over the mistakes and drawbacks but forward feasable proposals to right the wrongs.

Lev Zaykov said the Communist Party put the issue on a singular plane. Perestroyka would succeed if we achieved real participation of broad public circles in running society. He also said what was taking place inside the nation was inseparable from its foreign policy, aimed at ridding the world from a nuclear threat. The first practical step in this direction had just been made—the treaty had been signed with the United States on abolishing a whole class of nuclear arms. We are aware, Lev Zaykov said, that only a fraction of the weapons at hand is being eliminated, but the treaty is important in that Pershing-2 missiles, which take minutes to reach Soviet territory, are being removed from our doorstep. The treaty also promotes trust, which is an inalienable component of interstate relations. Lev Zaykov, a member of the political bureau, said the treaty signifies the beginning of action on the Soviet program to abolish nuclear arms in the world by the end of the century.

Shevardnadze Attends Moscow Ceremony 18 Dec

LD181737 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] The ceremonial unveiling of a memorial plaque dedicated to Georgiy Vasiliyevich Chicherin, USSR people's commissar for foreign affairs, took place today in Moscow at house No 21-5 on Kuznetskiy Most, where the People's Commissariat of the USSR Foreign Ministry was located until 1952.

The meeting was attended by Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and, USSR Foreign minister.

Ryzhkov Continues Visit to Alma-Ata

LD182259 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Dec 87

[I. Dvorkin report over video; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Alma-Ata, Lenin Square. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov came here today to lay flowers at the monument to the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet State. The emergence of Kazakhstan's development in the family of fraternal republics is connected with Lenin's name.

Also today Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov visited the Alma-Ata shopping precinct. Here there is a department store, a household goods store, an open-air market and a covered market, and a cafeteria. Every year hundreds of thousands of tonnes of the most diverse goods are sold here, worth tens of millions of rubles. Representatives of state and cooperative trade operate here side-by-side. Produce from private subsidiary plots is also brought here. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov was interested in the development of all these forms of trade and prices, and the possibilities for supplying the market with various quality goods.

Medeo is one of the world's largest highland sports complexes. It is 1,700 meters above sea level. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov viewed the facilities of the ice-rink. On Saturdays and Sundays the rink is available to the residents of Alma-Ata and the guests of Kazakhstan's capital. The trip to Medeo ended with a visit to the mud-flow dam. This engineering structure reliably protects Alma-Ata from powerful flows of mud and rocks. [video shows Ryzhkov and entourage walking up outdoor steps; various shots of an open-air ice rink; speed-skaters; Ryzhkov being shown around the dam]

Ryzhkov Visits Mine in Dzhezkazgan

LD181349 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Dec 87

[V. Glukhovtsev report over video; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Glukhovtsev] Dzhezkazgan has its own difficult but glorious destiny. This town has grown up in the waterless semidesert area of central Kazakhstan. Today it is one of the country's leading nonferrous metallurgical centers.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov today visited Mine No.65, which is one of the largest at the Dzhezkazgan deposit. At a depth of 300 meters at the so-called cutting face Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov acquainted himself with the functioning of Soviet-Produced Self-Propelled machinery. Here he had a conversation with miners.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified official] What complaints do you have?

[Machine operator] My complaint is that the automatic coupling is the weakest point. As soon as there is some play between the tractor and the trailer, the engine mountings, the gearbox mountings, and the water-tank start breaking loose. We also have to change the hoisting jacks frequently. The design is not very good.

[Ryzhkov] Is the bodywork poor as well?

[Machine operator] The bodywork metal is awfully poor.

[Ryzhkov] Is that on the bottom, or at the side?

[Machine operator] It is both on the side and on the wing.

[Official] How is the design from the spillage viewpoint?

[Machine operator] We are not allowed to make any spillage.

[Ryzhkov] Tell me, are you all working in a team?

[Official] Yes, they are working in a specialized team.

[Ryzhkov] Does that then apply in the quarry and here, too?

[Official] They are working for the end result, but the system inside the team itself is specialized.

[Ryzhkov] I see, but they are working for a single end result?

[Official] Yes, indeed. [end recording]

[Glukhovtsev] A great number of problems have built up in the miners' collective. During the period of restructuring people have been seeking ways to enhance the efficiency of their labor, lower the cost of extracting ore, and reduce direct expenditures. They are concerned also about the question of why the tackling of social tasks is lagging behind the development of the production base.

The Dzhezkazgantsvetmet association is going over to full financial autonomy, self-financing, and self-recouping starting with the new year. Therefore, an underestimation of these problems that are of importance to the collective could have a negative effect on the general economic results of the country's very important mining and metallurgical sector. [video shows Ryzhkov touring mine, talking with machine operator and unidentified official, meeting miners]

Slyunkov Addresses Conference on Economic Studies
LD181739 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] There was a conference at the CPSU Central Committee today that discussed the tasks of ministries and departments in improving the organization of universal economic education and restructuring mass economic studies.

A report was delivered by Comrade Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Ligachev Attends Moscow Soiree
LD200524 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 19 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A soiree devoted to the 100th anniversary of the birth of the outstanding Soviet composer and musical figure and people's artist of the Soviet Union Yuriy Aleksandrovich Shaporin was held at the USSR Bolshoy Theater in Moscow today. Present at the soiree were comrade Ligachev, representatives of local soviet and voluntary organizations, and cultural figures.

Ligachev, Talyzin Attend Teaching Aids Exhibition
LD182359 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 18 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] Today Comrades Ligachev and Talyzin and Comrade Maslyukov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, visited an exhibition of technical teaching aids and scientific-methodological literature for primary schools and vocational-technical colleges organized at the National Economy Exhibition in connection with the forthcoming plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on restructuring of secondary and higher schools in the USSR.

They examined the technical teaching aids shown at the exhibition, as well as classroom and laboratory equipment and audio-visual aids—both those already in use and new ones developed with a view to the requirements of school reform. In the course of discussion, the attention of the USSR Ministry of Education, the State Committee for Vocational Education, the Ministry of Timber and Paper Industry, the Ministry of Radio Industry, the Ministry of Electrical Equipment, and the Ministry of Instrument Making was drawn to serious shortcomings in the organization of the development and production of technical teaching aids, which frequently fail to meet the needs of public education both quantitatively and qualitatively. Emphasis was put on the need to speed up the provision of new types of classroom and laboratory equipment for the teaching process, and it was recommended that the necessary forces and resources be concentrated on developing and producing technical equipment for education, and that the range of enterprises manufacturing audio-visual aids should be expanded.

Greater glasnost was called for in the work on the planning of new textbooks on a basis of open competitions both during their development and during the summing up of results.

Kim Philby Engaged in Making 5-Part TV Feature

PM192030 Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Dec 87 p 4

[Unattributed article: "Among the Creators of 'The Game' "under the rubric "We Answer Readers' Questions"; first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] It was once written, I recall, that the Soviet intelligence agent Kim Philby had arrived in Moscow. At the same time it was reported that on instructions from the Center he had at one time joined the British Secret Service where he worked for many years. Where is Comrade Philby now? (A. Kochergina. Melitopol).

Latvian Television reported:

Many people most likely no longer remember the items of the sixties about Comrade Kim Philby. He grew up in the family of an official in the British Colonial service in India. He acquired a brilliant education. He studied in Cambridge, at Trinity—one of the biggest aristocratic colleges in Britain. The spoke Hindi, Arabic, German, French, Spanish, and Turkish fluently, and of course English. Then he learned Russian. As a war correspondent for THE TIMES he worked in Spain in 1937. He was among a few Western journalists on whom Franco bestowed one of the highest honors. Prior to that he frequently travelled to Berlin on instructions from the Center, and there he met with many prominent fascist ringleaders. In the years of the Great Patriotic War Comrade Kim Philby's work helped to neutralize many fascist intelligence agents sent into our country's territory, and to save the lives of thousands of Soviet people. He succeeded in passing on the first information about the intention of the fascists to use new types of combat equipment on the front.

In British intelligence K. Philby rose rapidly. He became one of the leaders of MI-6, the Secret Intelligence Service. At one time he even headed the department for combating the USSR and the international communist movement. As a resident agent of the British Secret Service he was sent, "under cover" as a diplomat, to Istambul. To organize all kinds of actions he used to head for the Soviet-Turkish border in the vicinity of Ararat... Comrade Kim Philby was recalled to our country for the purpose of ensuring his safety.

K. Philby, 7 - years-old, is now participating in the making of a five-part television feature called "The Game." Based on facts of some 40 years ago, it will tell of the interference of foreign special services in the internal affairs of Latvia. Speaking on Latvian television, K. Philby declared that since the thirties he has considered the USSR as his homeland.

Latvian TV Carries Series

LD181755 Moscow TASS international Service in Russian 1630 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Riga, 18 December—Valdis Sirmgalvis, TASS correspondent writes:

Declassified archive documents, and interviews with Latvian Chekists and with former CIA and British intelligence agents form the basis for the television series "The Game" [Ingra], which began to be carried on Latvian television today. The film tells about an operation aimed at neutralizing the attempts by Western special services to destabilize the situation in this region in the years 1946-1956. Kim Philby was photographed in the film along with other Soviet intelligence officers. The British authorities had instructed him—then a prominent British intelligence leader—to organize subversive activity against the USSR, for whom he had been working secretly since the thirties

In the first series, the authors of the series recall the events of the World War II, when the Latvian bourgeoisie who actually served the Hitlerites, started a feverish quest for protectors in the event of the defeat of fascist Germany. At that time, many nationalists from the Baltic republics, including Gestapo and Abwehr agents, resold themselves to the British and U.S. special services. They hoped that their subversive activity against the USSR would obstruct the restoration of Soviet power in the Baltic region.

Starting in 1946, Western special services began dispatching to the Baltic region masses of spies, weapons for the nationalists who had remained in the forests, and resources for carrying out acts of sabotage. Over a period of 10 years, 30 spies fell into the hands of the Cheka [Extraordinary Commission for Struggle Against Counterrevolution and Sabotage]. The thing is that the "nationalist armed groups" which British and U.S. agents were allegedly setting up on Soviet territory consisted of...staffers of the State Security Committee of the Latvian SSR.

"The Western special services, in recruiting spies—emigrees from the Soviet Baltic republics—relied on the ringleaders of the reactionary emigre circles," Kim Philby told journalists on the eve of the film's showing. He reported that, apart from others, subdepartment "North" of the British special services, which dealt with the organization of subversive activity in this region, was also subordinate to him. Kim Philby gave a high appraisal of the work of the Latvian Cheka in those years. The purpose of the operation—to cut off the channels of active intervention by Western special services in the affairs of sovereign Soviet Latvia—was fulfilled. Three subsequent programs, which will be aired in 1988, will give details.

Restructuring Impact on Elected Organs

PM181453 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Restructuring Is Setting an Examination. How Elected Party Organs Are Reporting Back"]

[Text] We are resolving the very serious task of renewing our society and accelerating the country's socioeconomic development. And practice convinces us that, in order to attain the goal more quickly, we must mobilize all the forces and potential available locally. Party committee plenums and meetings of Communists with discussion of elected organs' reports on work on guiding restructuring are of special significance in this sense. They are, in fact, called upon to be a militant review of the party organizations' activity since the 27th party congress and an important stage in the preparations for the 19th All-union Party Conference.

Reports are a strict examination in restructuring. Defining the political significance of this very important all-party campaign, the CPSU Central Committee noted in its adopted resolution the need to step up work in all components and at all levels of the party and to eliminate the lag behind the dynamic development of vital processes in a number of party committees. An analysis of the style and methods of party leadership of restructuring and a principled discussion of achievements and blunders, it was stated at the recent CPSU Central Committee conference, are called upon to galvanize the activity of the entire elected party aktiv, overcome the lethargy of those who have not renounced the old work methods, resolutely reveal our reserves, and raise the activity of all party committees to the level of the demands of the new stage of restructuring.

To judge from PRAVDA readers' letters and reports by PRAVDA correspondents, Communists as a rule pay great attention to elected organs' reports. They participate actively and with interest in the interpretation of the path traveled and in the search for solutions to the problems encountered today and seek to answer these questions fully and accurately: Does the party organization head the renewal process which has begun, do its efforts give people a creative boost, has it achieved palpable results in developing democracy, strengthening order and discipline, improving working people's working and living conditions, and enhancing their well-being?

For example, there was a businesslike and principled discussion at a Nagorskiy party raykom plenum in Kirov Oblast. None of its participants was left indifferent. Mounting the rostrum, the raykom members spoke frankly and without smoothing sharp corners about the miscalculations that were not avoided, about the forms and means to be adopted by the party arsenal at the new stage of restructuring, and about what must be renewed and what rejected. They took an exacting approach to those who had failed to ensure a specific shift in the sector assigned to them. In the opinion of many people, such a discussion of the report will help the party raykom bureau and apparatus to improve their work substantially.

Whether the reports will be an effective means of spurring into action all party organization members and all cadres depends largely on the atmosphere reigning at plenums and meetings of communists. It is important to ensure broad opportunities for holding a democratic discussion and comradely debates, so that everyone can openly voice his opinion, speak of urgent matters, and propose measures to rectify shortcomings and improve matters. It is only in such an atmosphere that the sincerity and interest of every Communist take shape. And it must be constantly remembered that these are indispensable preconditions for enhancing the business-like activeness of every party organization, components of its prestige, and important conditions for success.

In the course of the discussion of reports glasnost and criticism must be spearheaded both at finally scrapping the braking mechanism and at giving all possible support to everything progressive that strengthens the socialist economy, ideology, and morality.

Emphasis must be placed, above all, on the in-depth analysis and personal assessment of the individual contribution of every member of elected party organs and of their secretaries to the collective work. The question must be put like this: In what way do you fulfill your duties, and do you conform to the demands of the time and the demands of restructuring? It is more important than ever today to determine whether a particular leader or communist is capable of working properly and whether or not he accepts our policy in practice. No words or promises not backed up by real work can be taken into consideration. Everyone must be called specifically to account for the assigned task. And strictly!

But it comes to light in the course of reports and at certain plenums and meetings that precisely this has not happened. PRAVDA has already spoken about the report of the Tsentralnyy party raykom bureau in the city of Tolyatti. Its chief shortcomings were lack of exactingness and lack of personal analysis of the work of all bureau members. Whereas more than one-third of those polled in a questionnaire distributed before the plenum pointed out that the standard of the raykom's leadership of party organizations had remained virtually unchanged and that a creative atmosphere had not been created, the bureau, in the opinion of the majority, was poorly seeking new forms and methods of party work. Given such an approach, can there really be any hope of speedy changes here?

There are still many shortcomings in the work of the Saratov Oblast party organization, particularly in the leadership of agriculture. However, an obkom plenum

leveled very toned-down and extremely streamlined criticism at the secretaries and other bureau members in charge of the agro-industrial committee, as well as the first secretary.

We could, unfortunately, continue such examples. Overregimentation, formalism, and the desire to embroider the existing reality, to hide shortcomings, and to reduce the discussion of reports to the issuing of compliments are still tenacious. In some places attention is focused on "objective" difficulties, instead of analyzing the style of party work. No, the time for such measures has passed. What is needed today is a competent and exacting party-minded discussion of the problems of restructuring. It is also necessary to give a new boost to all the democratic principles and norms enshrined in the CPSU Statutes, really improve the practice of collective work, and enhance the role of the elected aktiv, which must really set the tone in resolving all questions of party life and be a skilled organizer.

We must resolutely rid ourselves of those who fail to cope with their duties, who are rich in promises but not deeds, who act in the old way, on the principles of freeloading and phrasemongering, or, even more so, who have compromised themselves. The communists of Krasnodar Kray party organization take a principled approach to this question. If party committes and bureaus work unsatisfactorily there, individual members of those organs are without fail replaced and their leadership is strengthened. Thus, more than 500 secretaries of primary and shop party organizations have already been voted out [pereizbran] there since the start of the reports.

It should be noted that the success of a report is determined to a considerable degree by the preparations for it. It is important to consult communists, working people, and the entire public before plenums and meetings in order to study and take account of people's opinions on the activities of party committees. There are many effective means and methods for this: questionnaires and sociological research, unified political days and meetings in labor collectives, telephone "direct lines" and much besides. There is no need to fear direct and sharp assessments, still less to scorn them when analyzing the work of bureau and committee members.

Representatives of higher party organs bear special responsibility. Their attendance at reports is not an embellishment of a measure but specific, serious work. They are obliged to know well the life of the organization they are visiting, to judge competently the progress of restructuring in it, and to act, above all, as organizers, consultants, advisers, and assistants.

The press, radio, and television are called upon to devote the maximum attention to the report campaign. Readers and viewers expect from them objective information on the work of elected organs, serious thinking, intense ideas, clashes of different approaches, a vivid showing of everything valuable that the practice of restructuring has accumulated, and, at the same time, frank and principled criticism of shortcomings which hinder work.

Communists' efforts are now shifting increasingly in the direction of constructive work on organizational, ideological, political, and moral backup for the tasks at the second, most important stage of restructuring. A topical theme is how enterprises are preparing for the transition to full economic accountability [khozraschet] as of 1 January, what good experience there is here, and what should be corrected without delay. Everything must be done to ensure that the discussion of elected organs' reports stimulates the activeness and enhances the militancy of all party organizations.

Article on Zionist Anti-Soviet Campaign

PM171621 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 15 Dec 87 p 3

[K. Ivanenko article under the rubric "Problems, Reflections": "In the Harness of World Reaction"]

[Text] It has been known for a long time that every action causes a reaction. The world, tired of living in a state of alarm and tension, welcomes with hope the thaw in international climate and the move toward detente. But positive changes also cause activity at the opposite end of the scale of social life. Anticommunists of all hues are striving to organize a broad psychological and propaganda offensive against the USSR and to undermine the peoples' trust in Soviet peace initiatives. A significant role in this noisy campaign has been assigned to Zionists.

The process of profound changes in the Soviet Union does not at all suit the Zionist ideologists. Glasnost and the open discussion of our problems trump all their cards. Especially as regards the problem of national relations, and the struggle against prejudices and views that are alien to socialism. The open [glasnoye] discussion of these questions denies them an opportunity to embark on political speculations on a "hot" topic. The materials of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum say bluntly that any manifestations of national narrow-mindedness constitute a specific expression of negative phenomena and deformations in the sphere of national relations. The attitude toward Zionism was also unambiguously outlined. Special emphasis was placed on attention to the need to place the struggle against Zionism and the struggle against anti-Semitism on one and the same footing.

Of course, this approach does not and could not at all suit the Zionist leaders, who are used to drawing strength from years-long propaganda spectaculars about "Soviet anti-Semitism." These campaigns include both traditional attempts to present the Soviet criticism of Zionism as "a new form of anti-Semitism" and talk about the

allegedly "trampled rights of Soviet Jews." Zionist propaganda is particularly diligent in the latter. Its tactics—to force on word public opinion the idea of systematic violations of human rights—are widely known.

Extreme right-wing Zionist circles, especially in the United States, are the most zealous participants in the hypocritical campaign "in defense of human rights in the USSR." During the last week before M. Gorbachev's visit to the United States, the U.S. press doggedly advertised a decision by the U.S. National Conference on Soviet Jewry to organize a so-called "Washington mobilization" which was planned to take the form of noisy provocative demonstrations before and during the summit meeting. In fact, demonstrations were organized in Washington during those days by several Zionist organizations, including the National Conference. The purpose of these events, according to the design of their instigators, was to "convince" the U.S. Administration to act firmly at the talks and to force the Soviet side to "solve" the question of "defense" of human rights. Unless this is done, as National Conference leaders claim for example, it will be supposedly impossible to establish an atmosphere of trust between the two great powers. Moreover, the leadership of the National Conference and other similar organizations presents the problem of human rights in a light that suits them, virtually reducing it to the question of unrestricted emigration by citizens of Jewish nationality from the USSR. The show, according to the script of stage managers from the National Conference, was planned on a large scale. The notorious Sharanskiy, Slepak, Edelshteyn, and other former Soviet citizens arrived from Israel to take part in the Zionist demonstrations in Washington, intended to play the role of "victims of arbitrariness" by the Soviet authorities in the provocative gathering. The theatrical nature of such political farces is obvious.

But Zionist circles and their patrons are not satisfied with just provocative noise being fanned in the West. Individuals with pro-Zionist leanings in our country enjoy equally thorough attention. After all, there is a need for "proof" of the persecution of Jews by the Soviet authorities. What is to be done about it? Once again a case for noise and scandalous actions. We have already seen on television the "demonstration" by several young people outside the Television Center building on 26 October, on the eve of the television linkup between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress. Even the most naive of viewers realized that the attempt to rouse public opinion in the West before this program came on the air was nothing but downright speculation on allegedly existing "denials" of the right to emigrate from the USSR. The same thing happened also on Sunday, 6 December, when about 20 persons, striving mainly to come within range of foreign correspondents' camera lenses, fervidly demonstrated their desire to travel to the "land of their forbears." Having joined forces with demagogues and downright provocateurs, pro-Zionist elements used their peculiar "demands" to try to divert attention from the peace-loving slogans by Muscovites welcoming the idea of the disarmament talks.

Iosif Begun, who was given official permission to leave our country back on 7 September, is a mandatory participant and instigator of all provocative demonstrations at the Vostryakovskoye Cemetery, the Old Arbat, and elsewhere in Moscow. Permission to emigrate is also held by many other participants in these demonstrations. But to emigrate just like that?... No, they are in no hurry. Boris Begun also "demonstrated" with his father in the Old Arbat in February. But, having received permission to emigrate, he started making demands... to retain Soviet citizenship.

In order to understand the meaning of all these manipulations, it must be noted that such behavior does not differ in any way from the tactics chosen by Zionist centers. For a long time they fueled feelings about the "refusals" preventing "family reunions." But the "refusals" story is losing its effect before their very eyes. Suddenly, a new motif is picked up—the retention of Soviet citizenship. Why do they need that? The answer is simple: There is need to create a new "stumbling block" in the problem of emigration and to expand the base for whipping up pro-Zionist feelings and fanning commotion. Furthermore, every "refusenik" activist is bound to leave behind a proper replacement on whom Zionist emissaries (hiding behind diplomatic passports, as a rule) could lean. There is also an attractive opportunity for unhindered travel to and fro by propagandists and agitators, although such considerations appear altogether stupid against the background of developed international tourism.

In this context, therefore, I. Begun's activity is extremely eloquent. It was no accident that it was officially recognized by Israel's ruling circles, which recently awarded him the Y. Alon Prize (named for the "hero" general of the 1967 aggression) "for contribution to the cause of Zionism."

The following fact also indicates that the Zionist propaganda is targeted with sufficient accuracy. The "action" at the Vostryakovskoye Cemetery was timed to coincide with the anniversary of the Babiy Yar tragedy. Essentially it turned into gross speculation upon the humanitarian feelings of millions of people, upon the very memory of the victims of fascism. This blatant provocation was inspired by Begun, as well as by Slepak. The same one who participated in the so-called "Washington mobilization."

The Soviet public, including the Anti-Zionist Committee, gave a fitting rebuff to the "champions" of the "Jewish people's" fate. As a matter of fact, the advocates of their "national self-awareness" themselves are not particularly overburdened by moral considerations. In order to evade the regulation which prohibits the abandonment of elderly parents, someone by the name of

Tsitronov submitted a false certificate of their deaths when obtaining permission to emigrate. And yet his father and mother are alive!

Zionist propaganda tactics have also noticeably changed on another question today. Under conditions of broader opportunities for emigration from the USSR, slogans of so called spiritual Zionism are now being brought into play increasingly frequently. Since the idea of total emigration of Jews to Israel has been discredited by time itself, attempts must be made to develop nationalist feelings in their countries of residence, and primarily the socialist countries.... This is being done with the help of mendacious cries about organized "persecution" of Jewish culture in the USSR.

Exclamations about "persecuted Jewish culture" and "trampled" human rights can be heard today also around the White House. Who benefits from this, but the extreme right-wing forces in the anticommunist camp? Those who are trying to obstruct the developing process of easing of international tension. And in this instance Zionism is being used as a tool by the **entire** [boldface as published] imperialist reaction. Never mind, this is not the first time.

Throughout its history, Zionism has always acted as a tool of imperialist forces in the world arena and the Near East. The history of Zionism in Palestine is the history of territorial seizures and suppression of the Arab national liberation movement. This policy fully coincided with the interests of first British and later U.S. imperialism, extremely keen on Israel as an instrument to exert pressure on Arab countries. It is no accident that this state is under U.S. "wardship."

The nature of the Zionist political regime in Israel is determined primarily by the expansionist aspirations of the country's ruling circles which are against Israel's withdrawal from the lands occupied in 1967, against the granting of the right of self-determination to the Arab Palestinian people and the creation of their own independent state. The elementary rights of representatives of the Arab minority are mercilessly trampled against the background of talk about human rights. There is, moreover, discrimination against Jews of eastern origin, and blatantly racist and pro-fascist groupings and organizations are flourishing. Israel's foreign and domestic policy is inseparably linked with Zionist centers and organizations in Western countries whose financial aid, together with the enormous aid from the United States, enables Israel to wage incessant wars in the Near East.

In this context, one would logically raise the question about the position and role of Zionism within the system of contemporary imperialism. There is a frequently held opinion—reflected also in our press—that Zionism is a "unique" and self-sufficient phenomenon. Like some "universal concern," Zionism supposedly enmeshes the whole world and even invisibly guides the strategy and tactics of imperialism as a whole. This viewpoint serves primarily the purpose of the Zionists themselves. It is, after all, they who claim a "special" role for this ideology in world history. And it is also they who carefully overlook the fact that Zionism is an offspring and part of imperialist ideology and policy and that Israel occupies a subordinate position within the system of imperialism and anticommunism.

The Marxist approach toward an analysis of Zionism does not suit the Zionist leaders and ideologists. If Zionism were to be examined from the viewpoint of the general laws of historical social development, it would become clear that its existence is subject to the contradictions and crises inherent in any bourgeois ideology and practice.

For a long time now Zionist leaders have been powerless to conceal the fact that international Zionism has never been, and today is even less so, a monolithic system. Its two main centers—the Israeli and the American—are engaged in an acute backstage struggle for dominance in the basic leading organs of international Zionism, primarily the World Zionist Organization. The Israeli ruling circles, striving to present Israel as the "land of the forbears" and the "state of Jews of the whole world," would like to dictate their will to all Jewish communities in the world. But U.S. Zionists—the financial donors of the Israeli economy—dispute this "right" of the Israeli upper crust. Growing contradictions within the World Zionist Organization, the decline of its authority in Jewish communities, the fall of its numerical strength, and the disappointment of young people of Jewish origin in Zionism—all these gave ground to some of the more sober-minded representatives of this organization's leadership to draw a conclusion about its ideological crisis.

It is, however, not just a matter of crisis within the organization—the entire ideology and practice of Zionism are bursting at the seams. There is growing dissatisfaction among ordinary members of Jewish communities in the West with the aggressive expansionist course of Israeli ruling circles. Profound alarm is caused among the Jewish public by racist and pro-fascist groupings in Israel itself, and primarily an offensive fascist organization like the "Kach" party (whose Fuehrer M. Kahane has been a Knesset deputy since 1984). Almost all main Jewish organizations in the United States have condemned the gangster-like anti-Arab actions by Kahane and his associates. In Israel itself there is a steadily growing movement of protest against the ruling circles' hardening aggressive anti-Arab policy, against the stepping up of racist trends within the country. This movement reflects the process of polarization within Israeli society and positive changes in Israeli public awareness. Growing numbers of Jews in Israel clearly perceive the link between the developing racism of Zionism's ultra-right wing and the aggressive policy of the ruling clique which demoralizes the country's Jewish population, the link between occupation and the spirit of violence which permeates Israeli society.

These processes, ripening within the minds of the world's Jewish population, cannot but alarm the ideologists of Zionism. This is why, taking advantage of the general activation of reactionary forces, they are making great efforts to regain their positions and to build up political capital by playing up to right-wing anti-Soviet forces. It is they who are striving to impart a semblance of viability to their own ideas by fanning the myth about the existence of numerous supporters of Zionism in the Soviet Union. Hence the touching concern about Jewish culture.

The problem of exposing the reactionary nature of Zionism's ideology and practice is ever topical. But it demands particular thoroughness and conscientiousness of our propaganda and science. The approach to this problem also requires tact, of which V.I. Lenin spoke in the context of questions of national relations. Any distortions of the class essence of this phenomenon or of the various aspects of Zionism would give grounds for the emergence of nationalistic trends. The present stage of the struggle against Zionism and anti-Semitism persistently demands the introduction of additional clarity to the theoretical interpretation of these complex phenomena.

Mention must be made of the fact that individual "anti-Zionist" publications, written from positions which are clearly far removed from Marxism and genuine historical science, still appear in Soviet literature in parallel with an entire series of works containing a scientific class analysis of the Zionist "idea" and of anti-Semitic prejudices. These publications at times also contain downright fabrications contradicting the class evaluation of, and the internationalist approach to, basic questions in the sphere of national relations.

The most widespread and serious mistake consists of the nonscientific approach used by some authors toward the ideological roots of Zionism, which leads them to claim an almost mystical might and all-pervading nature for Zionism. To put it briefly, the authors of such works at times forget that Zionism is a variety of bourgeois nationalism, that it is not some sort of unique and self-sufficient phenomenon. The idea of the existence of some sort of alliance between Zionists and Masons, of a "conspiracy" between them for the purpose of achieving "world domination," leads to downright distortion.

Look no further than the attempts by some zealous "fighters" against Zionism to look everywhere for the "Star of David" or other "Zionist-masonic" symbolism allegedly proving the invisible presence of a "conspiracy!" We are no longer talking about applying the criteria of a scientific approach, but about taking leave of elementary commonsense. Can anyone imagine that the ideological adversary is so stupid as to subsist on such absurdities? Ridiculous! But invective like this would seem to be best suited to the purpose of... the Zionists themselves, who take advantage of scandals, "sensational revelations," and "vigilance" inflated to absurd proportions for their own purposes.

Furthermore, we must not close our eyes to the remnants of anti-Semitism still surviving in everyday life in our country. Unfortunately, some publications also "work" on them. One can still come across people who are inclined to blame errors in our economy, architecture, and urban development on some malevolent spirit guided from outside. Insufficient understanding of actual events and the forgetting of historical truth also lead to manifestations of anti-Semitic remnants of the past. Some authors have even gone as far as to say that the Jewish pogroms in czarist Russia were nothing but "noisy clashes" between the Jewish and non-Jewish bourgeoisie. The essence of such innovations has little to do with the Marxist approach and the principles of genuine historicism.

The pseudoscientific verbosity about a "Zionist-masonic conspiracy" is simply a tasty morsel for Zionist and pro-Zionist propaganda. It is a transfusion of fresh blood into the myth about the existence of "anti-Semitism elevated to the rank of state policy" in our country, a myth which has discredited its own self.

Ever since the late seventies, the Institute for the Study of Jewish Problems in London has been printing selected materials from Soviet press and literature under the title "Soviet Anti-semitic Propaganda," with lengthy quotations of "scientific" tenets from the most offensive "works." Advantage is taken of any opportunity to convince the world's Jewish population that "Soviet anti-Semitism" exists.

By no means the entire Jewish population in capitalist countries is under the influence of Zionist ideology. Despite attempts by its pastors to convince everyone that "Zionist consciousness is immanently inherent in Jews all over the world," a movement of protest against the authorities' reactionary policy is ripening not only in Jewish communities in the West but also in Israel itself.

The question of scientific conscientiousness, of the observance of Marxist-leninist methodology in the analysis of social phenomena, acquires particular importance as regards the study of this problem. It is important not only in terms of theoretical armament against the ideological enemy, but also as regards the shaping of mature social awareness without narrow-minded ideas about the complexities of the contemporary world. As regards the shaping of genuine political culture in the spirit of the new thinking.

Writer Warns of Dangers of 'Phantom Glasnost'
PM181345 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Dec 87 p 11

[Aleksandr Levikov "Journalist's Notes": "Off-the-Record Press Conference. Reforms Plus Glasnost Is the Formula for Restructuring. But Some People Would Prefer To Read a Minus Sign"]

[Text] The directness of disputes and frankness of journals are breathtaking, and the phantom of glasnost is already haunting the "corridors of power." People fenced off by an armored wall of passes, secretaries, and aides are giving interviews increasingly often. They are meeting with the press, flattering the press, and informing the press. There are press conferences in sectorial industrial ministries, press conferences at the Ministry of Health, press conferences at the Gosplan, briefings at the MVD...

In the Foreign Ministry Press Center on Zubovskiy Blvd our statesmen and public figures, academicians, generals, and diplomats are questioned virtually daily in all languages of the world. My foreign colleagues are pleased. They say it has become more interesting to work in Moscow. They used to feed on rumors and information from dubious sources, but now there is more official information and it is more truthful. You can ask about anything you like on Zubovskiy Blvd. Including things that our press does not yet dare to write. The Press Center on Zubovskiy Blvd is a good sign of the new times and at the same time, paradoxical though it may seem, a reflection of the past. Unlike the foreign press, the Soviet press makes only occasional cautious use of the information obtained there. Only MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI regularly publishes the replies under its "At First Hand" rubric, but most of its print run goes abroad. It looks as though we continue to think that these replies are really intended for foreigners, and there's no need to open our compatriots' eyes.

When I appeared on television before the October celebrations (in the movie "The Revolution Continues"), I said that it is useless to speak about glasnost, go into raptures over glasnost, and prove the need for it. What is really necessary? To take advantage of glasnost always and in everything and to write what you think. Only then will the limits of the glasnost that really exists immediately become clear, and in many cases I am afraid that we will find merely phantom glasnost.

To be honest, our press is still not seen as a "great power." And so it has to whine and snap. LITERATURNAYA GAZETA was forced to publish a rejoinder about an RSFSR deputy minister of light industry who refused to provide information about a shoe factory constructed by the Italians in Kaluga on the pretext that it was "secret."

During a press conference at the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Internal Affairs Administration at 38 Petrovka St, journalists asked: Does the comprehensive program to combat drug addiction that has been in force in the capital since August 1987 contain classified information that cannot be divulged? They were told: "No." In this connection, IZVESTIYA writes: "The point is, that correspondents also heard an equally categorical 'no' from the leadership of the city prosecutor's office. The seemingly minor issue of the document's unobtainability assumed fundamental importance. An unclassified document has become virtually closed to the public." The editorial office was unable to obtain it. In another piece the reporter wonders: Why do all his interlocutors, at the mention of the word "coffee," say that deliveries of this commodity are "classified"? They would not give specific figures. The USSR Gosplan's reply was brief: The rule is to give no information over the telephone.

Would they have given it at a personal meeting? I must admit, I have been overwhelmed with doubts about Gosplan for some time. Especially since a press conference there.

It was conducted by Deputy Chairman Leonard Borisovich Vid. He spoke for around 30 minutes, making provisos the whole time: "I don't want you to make a big thing of this in the press, but for your information and so that editorial offices understand, I can say" (that the price of the oil we export has fallen sharply and we have lost a lot of hard currency, so our imports have also declined)... "Off the record, just to you personally, I would like to say" (that the 1988 state plan is "firmly and rigidly," as Vid put it, "oriented toward overfulfillment"). Do you understand? The 5-year plan exists on a countrywide scale, but "all its component parts, all the little building blocks, are planned to exceed it by some margin." This is what we were told "off the record": "An enterprise director will say to you: What's going on? I've been given a target that's higher than the 5-year plan, they're putting the squeeze on. But you must clearly realize that this is the economic situation in the country"... "I will quote you an example off the record" (regarding the fact that "ministers have really come under fire in the Council of Ministers for their inability to organize direct economic links"), and so forth...

When the journalists were told to ask questions, I rose, introduced myself, and asked:

"Tell me, what kind of event is it that we are attending?"

The question caused perplexity among the Presidium. After all, the invitation (bearing the USSR coat of arms and the slogan "Proletarians of all countries, unite!") said in black and white that Gosplan invited journalists "to a scheduled press conference." I had to explain:

"A press conference is information for the press. But you keep on warning us that this is 'off the record.' So what is the event staged by Gosplan called?"

Leonard Borisovich Vid was embarrassed:

"I must have been making those provisos out of old habit.... There was nothing especially secret about my briefing.... So oil prices have declined and we have lost hard currency? Fine, you can write about that if you like...."

However, the specific facts are not the point. They do indeed contain no secrets. What aroused my doubts is the motives for the Gosplan leadership's meeting with journalists. Not to stand on ceremony, we were actually not so much informed as given instructions. We were advised not to listen to the desperate cries of economic managers whose heads were spinning because once again the plans exceed the production capacities and do not tally with material and technical supply. Enterprises like to complain about what they have not received, L.B. Vid told correspondents. They've been given plenty. Let them assimilate everything they have. They will have to work hard and exceed the 5-year plan.

The nature of the questions put by journalists speaks for itself: "If state orders that totally swallow up production capacities are issued, what is to become of the Law on the Enterprise?"... "Are we seeing a recurrence of willful planning under specious slogans?"... "Enterprises no longer want to be made a fool of. They are told: You can appeal after New Year, but for now kindly accept the state order. Surely what this means is this: You will be hanged now, but you can appeal the verdict tomorrow?"...

Thanks to the pressure from the newsmen, which came as a surprise to Gosplan, as Leonard Borisovich Vid admitted ("The last press conference was quiet and trouble-free"), the discussion developed in an unplanned direction. Gosplan defended itself and went on the offensive—it explained its position.

In a literary turn of phrase, we were told, the state order "is the only door through which the state and its centralized target can now enter the enterprise." Petty planning is a thing of the past, but all the most important items are included in the state order. It is wrong to say that it totally fills up capacities and "swallows them up." Not so! It's different everywhere. Extractive, raw materials sectors—single-product sectors [monootrasli]—demonstrate a high degree of acceptance of state orders: 90-100% of their program. But what about machine building? There, on average, state orders account for only 80%. It's true that the leading enterprises find themselves in a more complex position, they must shoulder more of the burden in order to balance the national economy's needs. Remember that since we have lost hard currency revenue, we cannot import as much. And the sharp decline in the sale of imported goods affects the state's financial position. Add to that the reduction in vodka sales, which used to yield considerable proceeds. "These questions have arisen, and they must be overcome." Don't go looking to blame someone's arbitrariness. It's just the way things are for us. We can in no way afford to repeat the dismal experience of 1986, when we made a mess of the plan in November-December, and so the whole of the 1st quarter of 1987 was wrecked. So we must work flat out and exceed the 5-year plan target. "That's the way it is, but we can understand the enterprises."

Indeed! They need understanding! When it comes to the machine builders, according to their minister, Nikolay Aleksandrovich Panichev, the entire product list has been dubbed the "state order" at some enterprises, but no more than three-fourths ought to have been, for the sake of economic independence. And in the sector as a whole, under extremely strong plan pressure, state orders account for 86% of the production program.

After the Gosplan press conference PRAVDA published an article by A. Shabashkevich about the Tiraspol cotton textile association. Its title was rather long, but frank—"Enterprise's Economic Independence Dies Beneath the Blows of 'Requisitioning'" The journalist writes of its former director, Manukyan, who is now the republic's minister of light industry: "In his eyes I saw the sorrow of a man who is not accustomed to doing deals with his conscience." Lucky man. Or maybe unlucky—he will have a hard time. Most people have long since learned to do deals with their conscience. As soon as they begin to recover from this terrible ailment, they have another attack. You can easily die that way.

Another recent item from the central press: After Chimkent's "Voskhod" Sewn Goods Factory, the leading one in Kazakhstan's light industry, had drawn up its production plan and concluded a contract with suppliers, it was peremptorily ordered to increase output by R1 million. Its valid objections were overruled. Then came more and more additions to the plan. "The factory is in constant turmoil because of the willful commands from above" (V. Torskiy, "Contrary to Economic Accountability," PRAVDA, 7 December this year).

"We can understand the enterprises"? No, that is not put strongly enough. It is not only the state plan that is at stake. And it is not just the economic situation in the country that perturbs society. As I see it, there is something greater—faith. People's faith in the genuineness of the principles proclaimed by the new reform. Full economic accountability, independence, and self-financing—are they for real or just words? It is also a question of faith in restructuring itself. If that faith collapses, then the plan too will fall to pieces. You will be able to gather neither a harvest nor fragments of kind feelings and good intentions. If we fail, it will be once and for all.

The hopes of us all are pinned on the accuracy with which the rules of the new game are observed. All right, it used to be a case of "heave ho," "come on, more effort," and "the plan at any price," but now it has been proclaimed that we are renouncing bureaucratic coercion of the economy and the strong-arming of enterprises. Has this just been proclaimed, or is it really the case?

"How are workers and specialists," one correspondent asked, "to be convinced that the conditions in which they find themselves are actually real economic accountability? After all, you speak of the extremely intensive plans that have arrived via the state orders."

Vid's reply was this: "It should be explained at meetings." "I understand what the question is driving at," he added, noticing the "animation in the hall." "The state order has been thrust on people—now you go and explain it to them. But the same thing happened with state acceptance. Slackness had penetrated the norms and piece rates. By demanding order, state acceptance hit workers' pockets...."

The 9-month plan for deliveries according to contract was underfulfilled by R10 billion, journalists were told, and state acceptance accounted for R3 billion of that sum. "The press makes a big issue of the question of where state acceptance has 'caused trouble,' but it doesn't say where it has helped," Vid said. "Better produce 97% of the target but good output than 100% but junk. It is necessary to stop portraying state acceptance as a bogeyman."

Toward the end the leaders of the press conference were drenched in sweat and begged for mercy. But they praised the sharp discussion and no longer mentioned their initial warnings that things were "off the record." In some respects they taught us, the press, something, in others we taught them. That's the way it should be. The road toward glasnost must be followed from both ends.

However, we journalists too are products of our time. At the Gosplan, when I said that there can be no such thing as an "off-the-record press conference," a colleague sitting in the next row tried to call me to order: "Why are you making such a big issue of it? I feel like apologizing on your behalf." No, colleague! Apologize on your own behalf. I am certain that phantom glasnost is worse than silence. A blatant gag is franker, all the same, though it may be very inconvenient. It's awful when representatives of the press begin to go along with bogus glasnost. I still blush to recall certain episodes at an all-union press conference held in the IZVESTIYA auditorium soon after the party Central Committee June Plenum. When A.I. Iyevlev, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom, spoke, he was bombarded from all directions with questions about the general disorder: Unfortunately, food stores did not corroborate the optimistic information he had presented. The discussion was visibly sharpening, to mutual benefit. But all of a sudden two or three journalists deliberately began to make loud and angry remarks about their colleagues' "demagogic questions" and "philistine sentiments." My god, what do these people write about in their newspapers? What kind of truth do they present to their readers? People like us have got the dubious idea of "underlings" stuck in our heads. In former times underlings were not exactly spoiled with frankness and were condemned to fend for themselves so far as information was concerned. They were persistently habituated to microscopic doses of authorized information. It's time to abandon this. And we should not listen to those who voluntarily or otherwise try to push us into professional abasement.

Recently I went up to Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov, chairman of the USSR State Prices Committee, who was telling journalists about the upcoming price reform, and asked him why in several of his press interviews published in the central press he did not mention any of the interesting and thought-provoking figures he was now disclosing to us.

He was saying that in the "golden age of declining prices," as Pavlov put it, under Stalin, during the postwar period, we merely climbed down a little way from an extremely high level. Prices in the country had been creeping upward for decades. In 1928-1940, according to Pavlov, the general level of prices in state and cooperative trade had risen by a factor of more than six. The relevant figures for meat, butter, and fish were quoted by way of corroboration. By 1947, the time of the prices and wages reform, we had seen a threefold increase in prices compared with the prewar level. Yet wages had increased by only 45.8%. Moreover, R25 billion had been taken from the population in the shape of state loans, which were then virtually compulsory. "This is what formed the basis for the subsequent slight decline," V.S. Pavlov said.

I am not now going to assess the information we received. But serious press debate about prices—and what could now be more topical and controversial?—certainly requires that we be equipped with statistics. So why did the chairman of the USSR State Prices Committee confine himself in several long press interviews to general talk of the need for and orientation of the reform of price formation, yet back up his arguments with figures in a confidential conversation with journalists?

"I too cannot talk about everything," Valentin Sergeyevich admitted.

"But how are we going to convince readers of anything without figures?"

"You are probably the best judges of that. You are professional journalists, I'm not, so you must be able to make do with the figures available."

It is clearly supposed that journalistic professionalism lies in being "able to get along" without information, to suit the quite uncorroborated opinion expressed above. I'm sorry to say that that is how we are seen quite often, even in the period of glasnost. Therefore I say: It is a phantom. But times have changed. We cannot live in a world of phantoms portrayed as reality.

I hear talk of a "special situation" that allegedly in some respects justifies "falling short of glasnost" [nedoglasnost]. Come on, the situation in our country has always been special. It is not for nothing that we are so fond of the word. The situation has been postrevolutionary, wartime, postwar, prewar, wartime once again, again postwar—it has always been special, always tense and difficult. Even now it is complex. Nonetheless, the party

has adopted a course of democracy. Reforms plus glasnost—that is the formula for restructuring. But some people would like to read the formula with a minus sign. Glasnost or phantom glasnost? The answer to that question determines society's moral state during the battle that has begun. Remember that even in warfare, as Napoleon recognized, the fate of a battle is "three-fourths decided by the morale factor."

TASS Reports Earthquake in Tajikistan

LD211459 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1442 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Dushanbe, 21 Dec (TASS)—An earthquake occurred on the territory of Tajikistan today at 0728 Moscow Time. According to data from the "Dushanbe" seismic station, its epicenter was located 180 km North East of the republic's capital in the area of the remote mountain village of Ishten in Komsomolobadskiy Rayon. The tremor reached a strength of 6-7 points [scale not specified—fbis] at the epicenter, 4 points in the rayon centre of Garm, and 3 points in Kulyab and Dushanbe.

Details on the consequences of the earthquake are being established more precisely.

Hurricane Hits Bering Sea Coastal Region

LD181631 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Anadyr December 18 TASS—The Bering Sea coast has been in the grip of a hurricane for the fourth day. With the heavy snowfall, the wind velocity reaches 40 metres per second.

About 600 air passengers have found themselves in a predicament. The hurricane stopped air traffic on the routes linking Anadyr with the Bering, Providence, Iultinsk, and Chukchi Districts. There are no lessons at schools. Enterprises and services cruicial in ensuring settlements with electricity and heat supplies are functioning efficiently in complicated conditions. Cross-countyr vehicles on duty, specially allocated by enterprises, are taking home from work those who are in these conditions toiling in their working places.

The weather men warn that one more cyclone started shifting to the Chukchi Peninsula from the area of the Kuril Islands.

Economic

Report on Jan-Nov Industrial Performance

PM210925 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 51, Dec 87 (Signed to Press 10 Dec 87) p 13

["USSR State Committee for Statistics Report" under the headline:"On Industry's Work in January-November 1987"—boldface passages as published]

[Text] The output sales plan taking delivery commitments into account was fulfilled 98.3% in January-November 1987, but one in every three industrial associations and enterprises failed to cope with contract commitments.

Labor productivity growth amounted to 4.1%.

The profits plan was fulfilled, and above-plan accumulations in January-October this year amounted to R232 million. The prime costs of industrial output declined.

The growth of industrial output in the first 11 months amounted to 3.8%, including a 7.2% growth in November.

The fulfillment of contract commitments for deliveries and of the plan for profits, labor productivity growth rate, and output volume growth rate in January-November by national economic **complexes** is as follows (in percentages): [Columns in the following table represent: Column A—Fulfillment of contract commitments for output deliveries; Column B—Proportion of enterprises failing to fulfill contract commitments; Column C—Shortfall in output deliveries, millions of rubles; Column D—Fulfillment of profits plan (January-October); Column E—Actual labor productivity growth rate; Column F—Actual output volume growth rate]:

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Fuel and energy complex	99.1	38	402	108	4.6	3.2
Metallurgical complex	98.7	43	924	102	3.3	1.8
Machine building complex	96.9	64	2,781	96	3.9	4.3
Chemical industry and timber complex	97.8	55	1,945	97	4.3	3.1
Agro-industrial complex	99.2	24	800	98	3.5	3.2
Social complex (USSR Ministry of Light Industry)	98.8	35	1,052	98	4.1	1.2
Construction industry complex (USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry)	98.4	38	193	103	4.9	3.0

Data on industry's work in January-November for **union republics** (including industry under union-level jurisdiction) is cited below (in percentages): [Columns in the following table represent: Column A—Fulfillment of contract commitments for output deliveries; Column B—Proportion of enterprises failing to fulfill contract commitments; Column C—Savings (plus sign denoted by letter "p" in table indicates overexpenditure) in prime costs as percentage of the plan (January-October); Column D—Actual labor productivity growth rate; Column E—Actual output volume growth rate]:

	A	B	C	D	E
RSFSR	98.3	33	0.3	4.4	3.4
Ukrainian SSR	98.2	29	0.1	4.0	3.4
Belorussian SSR	99.4	14	0.6	6.3	6.6
Uzbek SSR	97.7	29	0.4	-0.2	1.7
Kazakh SSR	97.9	28	0.5	3.9	3.7
Georgian SSR	98.3	19	p0.3	2.1	2.5
Azerbaijan SSR	98.0	27	p0.1	4.4	4.7
Lithuanian SSR	99.7	7	0.5	4.7	4.3
Moldavian SSR	98.4	35	0.6	5.6	5.5
Latvian SSR	99.1	19	0.7	5.3	4.4
Kirghiz SSR	98.0	29	0.2	0.6	0.7
Tajik SSR	98.1	28	0.9	3.7	5.1
Armenian SSR	97.3	26	0.3	3.3	4.5
Turkmen SSR	99.0	19	0.9	1.3	2.0
Estonian SSR	99.6	16	0.7	4.5	3.0

Output worth R50 million, representing 0.4% of the total volume of output submitted for acceptance during November, was rejected by the state acceptance system. The proportion of output rejected by the state acceptance system is particularly high at enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, and the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems.

Basic indicators showing the production of the most important types of output by national economic complexes in January-November are cited below.

Fuel and Energy Complex [subhead]

	Produced in Jan-Nov 1987	Percentage plan fulfillment	Jan-Nov 1987 as percentage of Jan-Nov 1986
Electricity, billion kilowatt-hours	1,503	100.2	104
Oil (including gas condensate), million tonnes	571	101	102
Gas, billion cubic meters	661	102	106
Coal, million tonnes	693	102	101

A total of 6.7 million tonnes of oil, including gas condensate, and 13.6 billion cubic meters of gas was extracted over and above the plan.

USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry enterprises extracted 14 million tonnes of coal, including 8.2 million tonnes of coking coal, in excess of plan targets. At the same time, about half of coal extracting associations failed to cope with contract commitments on deliveries, and their indebtedness to consumers increased further still. The shortfall in deliveries of output during the 11 months amounted to R125 million.

Metallurgical Complex [subhead]

	Produced in Jan-Nov 1987	Percentage plan fulfillment	Jan-Nov 1987 as percentage of Jan-Nov 1986
Steel, million tonnes	148	100.4	100.6
Rolled ferrous metal products (finished), million tonnes	104	100.7	101
Steel pipes, million tonnes	18.6	99.99	103
Iron ore, million tonnes	230	101	100.4

The November plan for the production of basic types of metal products was fulfilled by metallurgy complex enterprises. The shortfall in steel pipe manufacture which had built up since the beginning of the year was reduced.

At the same time, the manufacture of the prescribed range of output was not ensured.

The plan for 17 out of 25 types of advanced highly efficient products was not fulfilled, particularly for the production of electric steel, cold-rolled sheet steel, high quality cold-drawn steel, heat-treated pipes, and high-impact oil-grade pipes.

The nonfulfillment of the plan in the prescribed range has an effect on the level of fulfillment of contract commitments. During January-November, enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy recorded a shortfall of R794 million in deliveries to the national economy, and the plan for output sales taking delivery commitments into account was fulfilled 98.3%.

Machine Building Complex [subhead]

	Produced in Jan-Nov 1987	Percentage plan fulfillment	Jan-Nov 1987 as percentage of Jan-Nov 1986
Turbines, million kilowatts	20.0	98	112
Turbine generators, million kilowatts	11.9	97	93
Large electric machines, thousands	23.4	92	98
AC electric motors, million kilowatts	49.3	93	97
Low-capacity electric motors for program-controlled machine tools (stepper motors), thousands	44.4	104	109
Metal cutting machine tools, billion rubles	2.6	94	98
of which, with digital program control	1.2	101	102
Forging and pressing machines, million rubles	594	87	95
Industrial robots, thousands	12.9	96	92
Instruments, automation equipment, and spare parts, billion rubles	4.5	98	105
Computer equipment and spare parts, billion rubles	4.8	101	111
Program control devices for all types of technological equipment, thousands	24.3	97	111
Petroleum apparatus, million rubles	223	90	98
Chemical equipment and spare parts, million rubles	862	88	97

Machine Building Complex [subhead]

	Produced in Jan-Nov 1987	Percentage plan fulfillment	Jan-Nov 1987 as percentage of Jan-Nov 1986
Industrial equipment and spare parts for the light and food industry, billion rubles	1.6	89	97
Tractors, million horsepower	47.2	95	95
Agricultural machines, billion rubles	3.8	99.2	105
Potato harvesting combines, thousands	7.8	95	111
Machines and equipment for stockraising and feed production, billion rubles	2.6	96	99.3
Feed harvesting combines, thousands	37.6	98	103
Excavators, thousands	37.3	94	96

Targets for the manufacture of most types of machines and equipment are not being met in the machine building complex.

The production of large electric machines and AC electric motors in November was less than planned. The manufacture of metal cutting machine tools and forging and pressing machines lagged significantly behind the plan, and planned volumes for the production of excavators, tractors, and chemical equipment were not achieved. Consequently, the shortfall in planned deliveries of output increased.

The November plan was fulfilled for the production of machines and equipment for stockraising and feed production and grain harvesting combines, but the lag that was allowed to build up in preceding periods, in terms of these types of output, was not made up.

Production of highly efficient advanced types of machine building output was also below the plan targets. Delivery shortfalls during this period included more than 1 million AI standard series electric motors, machines and equipment for continuous billet casting worth R28 million (46% of the annual plan), 4,100 diesel-engine trucks, 1,200 machine tools with digital program control, and other types of machines, equipment, and instruments.

There were breaches of delivery schedules for component machines and instruments within the machine building complex sector.

Chemical Industry and Timber Complex [subhead]

	Produced in Jan-Nov 1987	Percentage plan fulfillment	Jan-Nov 1987 as percentage of Jan-Nov 1986
Mineral fertilizers (in 100% nutrient equivalent), million tonnes	33.1	100.6	104
Chemical plant protection agents (in 100% active ingredients), thousand tonnes	300	100.3	98
Sulfuric acid, million tonnes	26.0	99.1	103
Caustic soda, million tonnes	3.0	98	102
Chemical fibers and yarns, million tonnes	1.4	100.4	103
Synthetic resins and plastics, million tonnes	5.0	98	102
Tires for motor vehicles, buses, agricultural machines, motor cycles, and motor scooters, millions	61.8	100.1	102
Commercial lumber (excluding small timber procurements), million trimmed cubic meters	249	97	99.7
Paper, million tonnes	5.7	99.5	100.2
of which newsprint, billion square meters	32.7	100.7	104

There was an increase in the production of individual types of advanced and highly efficient products: polypropylene, thermoplastic pipes and pipeline components, fiberglass and fiberglass products, synthetic fibers and yarns, radial tires, large veneer sheets, wood fiber slabs, chipboard, cement chipping slabs, and packaging cardboard. At the same time, the planned volume of output was not ensured for a number of these product types.

The plan for the production of commercial lumber, timber, paper, cardboard, and pulp was not fulfilled.

Construction Industry Complex [subhead]

	Produced in Jan-Nov 1987	Percentage plan fulfillment	Jan-Nov 1987 as percentage of Jan-Nov 1986
Cement, million tonnes	126	100.8	102
Precast ferroconcrete, million cubic meters	111	99	103
Asbestos cement sheet (shingle), billion standard tiles	8.0	100.1	102
Soft roofing and insulation materials, billion square meters	1.8	99.1	99
Asbestos, million tonnes	2.1	101	103
Window glass, million square meters	230	98	98

The construction complex industry failed to meet its targets for the production of precast ferroconcrete structures and components, including panels and structures for large-panel housing construction, soft roofing and insulation materials, and window glass.

Planned production volumes were not achieved for individual types of advanced and highly efficient materials, in particular plasterboard [gipsokartonnyy list] (97%), asbestos cement extrusion panels (77%), and sectional buildings (modules) made of lightweight metal components (96%).

The following figures describe the fulfillment of the plan for the production of **consumer goods**:

	Produced in Jan-Nov 1987	Percentage plan fulfillment	Jan-Nov 1987 as percentage of Jan-Nov 1986
FOODSTUFFS			
Meat, including Category I subproducts, (from state raw material resources), million tonnes	10.1	105	105
Sausage products, million tonnes	3.4	104	105

	Produced in Jan-Nov 1987	Percentage plan fulfillment	Jan-Nov 1987 as percentage of Jan-Nov 1986
Butter (from state raw material resources), million tonnes	1.6	106	103
Wholemilk products in milk equivalent (from state raw material resources), million tonnes	29.1	104	104
Commercial edible fish products, including canned fish, million tonnes	5.2	101	96
LIGHT INDUSTRY PRODUCTS			
Textiles, all types, billion square meters	11.5	99.96	103
Knitted articles, billion items	1.7	100.2	103
Hosiery, billion pairs	1.8	101	104
Footwear, million pairs	732	99.5	101
GOODS FOR CULTURAL, EVERYDAY, AND DOMESTIC PURPOSES			
Watches and clocks, millions	64.3	98	100.9
Chinaware and earthenware, million rubles	905	99.8	105
High-grade tableware (glass and crystal), million rubles	802	100.1	92
Radio receivers, millions	7.4	90	90
Television sets, millions	8.2	91	95
of which, color sets	4.2	87	105
Tape recorders, millions	4.5	89	105
Refrigerators and freezers, millions	5.4	97	100.4
of which, two- and three-compartment units	1.2	87	137
Washing machines, millions	5.2	97	107
Sewing machines, zig-zag type, thousands	869	101	104
Furniture, billion rubles	7.9	100.4	105
Automobiles, millions	1.2	100.1	100.4
Motorcycles, thousands	867	94	91
Disposable paper products, million rubles	669	104	108
Wallpaper, million standard lengths	470	102	115

Consumer goods output (excluding alcoholic beverages) in January-November this year was R292 billion, or 5% higher than in the corresponding period last year.

Enterprises in the processing sectors of the agro-industrial complex fulfilled their January-November plan for the production of basic foodstuffs. Above-plan production amounted to 489,000 tonnes of meat, 1.1 million tonnes of wholemilk products, 411 million standard cans of canned food, 25,000 tonnes of vegetable oils, and 466,000 tonnes of granulated sugar. In comparison with the corresponding period of 1986, the manufacture of these foodstuffs increased.

Enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Light Industry failed to meet their targets for the manufacture of individual types of textiles and of footwear. The overall shortfall in output deliveries amounts to R1.1 billion, with one enterprise in three failing to cope with its delivery commitments.

There was below-plan production of consumer goods by enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, and the machine building complex (except the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems, and the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry). The 11-month plan was not fulfilled by enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry and the USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry for the production of radio receivers and tape recorders, and by enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances for the production of refrigerators, freezers, and washing machines. There is a lag in the production of modern and

highly efficient goods like KSHD-270/80 "Mir" large-capacity refrigerators (USSR Ministry of Machine Building), deluxe electric vacuum cleaners (USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry), and "Elektronika-401m" color semiconductor television sets (USSR Ministry of the Electronics Industry).

Scientific

Manned Spacecraft "Soyuz-TM4" Launched 21 Dec

Preparations Made

LD182315 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The preparation of the spaceship "Soyuz-TM4" for launching is drawing to a close at the launch pad in Baykonur. Our special correspondents report:

[Begin recording] [video shows group of men in training gear listening to another man who sits in a glass-partitioned booth and addresses them over a microphone]

[Man in booth] In general, there are no changes. Everything remains as it is now. There are no changes. [word indistinct] is the same, the aiming point is the same, and the aiming vector is the same. So, everything remains the same as when you were preparing for tests.

[Correspondent] This talk took place between the crews and the ballistics specialist. These final consultations were held in the assembly-and-test building when the crews were already accepting the "Soyuz-TM4."

All those who are permanently working here have grown used to space equipment. But just look with what fascination Bulgarian space pilots Aleksandr Aleksandrov and Kazimir Stoyanov are looking at the space ship! [video shows two cosmonauts] They are currently undergoing training in Zvezdnyy Gorodok, and one of them will join the crew in the orbit. Eleven critical remarks were made after inspecting the ship, but now everything has been thoroughly checked, and all complaints have been rectified.

[V.G. Titov] There have been no fundamental complaints, but there are things that would allow the crew not to think later about problems that could arise. I think that even if they had not been corrected, the ship could be accepted anyway. But as there are opportunities to correct them, why not?

[Correspondent] Who is stricter in terms of acceptance, the commander or the flight engineer?

[Titov] The crew, of course, whether you like it or not. Everybody has parameters he has to check.

[Correspondent] The watches that will be showing the time in orbit are handed to the crew.

There are six signatures on the ships acceptance certificate, those of all the members of the operating and stand-by crews. The training is over, and a tough medical regime and a mild working regime have been imposed on them in the Kosmonavt hotel. There are only two mandatory kinds of training. Good capacity for work should be maintained right from the first minutes of weightlessness, and this depends to a great degree on the vestibular apparatus. Here is how it looks if you sit in the chair yourself. [video images begin to spin] And here, docking is being test-developed. [video shows a control panel with monitoring screens] This is the first complex dynamic operation after the ship has been placed in orbit.

The decision to launch will be taken by the State Commission after all the preparatory operations at the launch pad have been completed. Those taking part in this work had their picture taken today as a souvenir, which means the job is drawing to a close.

New Crew To Be Launched

LD190815 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] As you already know, comrade radio listeners, preparations are underway for the launching of the new crew for the space station Mir. We go over to Baykonur, where Leonid Lazarevich, our special correspondent, reports:

[Lazarevich] The launch of the spacecraft "Soyuz TM-4" is planned for Monday, 21 December at 1418 Moscow time.

Thus, in just over 2 days, a crew of three is to blast off from Baykonur launch site. As a reminder, two crews are preparing for the launch: the main one and the standby one. In the first crew are Vladimir Titov, the flight engineer; Musakhi Manarov, flight engineer; and Anatoloy Levchenko, cosmonaut-researcher. As you know, Levchenko is a meritorious pilot of the USSR.

The second crews consists of three Aleksandrs: Pilot cosmonaut Volkov; Kaleri, the flight engineer; and Shchukin, cosmonaut-researcher.

Now let us discuss today's events. Early this morning, we arrived in the assembly building—it was in fact not in the morning, but rather at night. In Moscow terms, it was 0500, or perhaps even 0400. The rockets and the craft were already on the launching pad. Do you know, they did not make any strong or great impression on me. I found it even difficult to believe that this equipment, which is not at all big and is only 50 meters long, is capable of launching three people into the orbit.

At 0500 this morning, the doors of the building opened and an electric locomotive smoothly brought the rocket out to meet the floodlights. It looked silvery, and it shone. It was a splendid sight! But let us go back to the events. It was still dark when the railway platform reached the lauching pad. The jacks, the hydro-jacks, lifted the rocket and the craft, and now it is already aimed at the sky—more precisely and obviously, at space. The rocket systems will be undergoing checking, and then there will be the launching.

Today, we journalists met with Kerim Aliyevich Kerimov, chairman of a state commission. He told us about the proceedings of pre-launch preparations and reported: The state commission will decide tomorrow which crew will go into space.

Official Explains Preparations

LD191523 Moscow TASS in English 1352 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Baykonur Cosmodrome December 19 TASS—At dawn today a booster rocket in conjunction with the "Soyuz TM-4" spaceship were taken out of the assembly-and-test building and installed at the launch site of the cosmodrome.

One of two crews, who have completed their training here for a space flight, will be launched in the spaceship to a near-earth orbit at 1418 Moscow time, on December 21, to take the place of Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov on board the "Mir" orbital station.

Lieutenant-General Kerim Kerimov, chairman of the state commission, has told journalists that the preparation for the space launch proceeds without deviation from the countdown graph. The two crews headed by pilot-cosmonauts of the USSR Vladimir Titov and Aleksandr Volkov have inspected and accepted the "Soyuz TM-4". All services of the cosmodrome function efficiently and confidently. Booster rocket tests which precede fuelling operations have already been started.

Describing the programme of the space expedition which begins on Monday, Kerim Kerimov pointed out that under the programme the arriving crew would be accepting the station from the "Taimyrs" for a week. Then Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov would return to earth. A research cosmonaut of the new crew would return together with them. Test pilots Anatoliy Levchenko and Aleksandr Shchukin have been prepared for this role. A flight engineer, Musa Manarov or Aleksandr Kaleri, would remain aboard the station together with the mission commander.

A decision as to which three-man crew will go to orbit will be taken by the state commission on December 20.

'Dry Rocket' Tested

LD192032 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] As we have already reported, the launch of the spaceship "Soyuz TM-4" carrying three cosmonauts is scheduled for 21 December, 1418 Moscow time. A meeting between journalists and Lieutenant-General Kerim Aliyevich Kerimov, chairman of the state commission and hero of socialist labor, took place today at the Baykonur launching pad.

[Begin Kerimov recording] The first step was taken today: The whole complex was moved to the launching facilities with the purpose of installing it and carrying out all operations required for the vertical testing of the so-called dry rocket, i.e. a rocket without fuel. Reports on the tests will arrive in the evening, and the state commission will be able tomorrow to make a decision on launching.

To organize such work as the preparation, launching, flight control, and landing of manned complexes remains even now a very complicated task because many collectives of various departments are involved. They have to be organized into one whole so that they can work as a single unit. From this point of view, it is our custom to instruct the state commission to provide this. Everything begins with examining the preparedness of equipment itself. This is the most important thing in the state commission's work. Then, all sorts of organizational issues follow. We examine them, too, at the commission's sittings and make decisions on, for example, the preparedness of the launching pad; services responsible for landing, search, and evacuation; and placement of vessels that are distributed along the way in case of an emergency ground or water landing. New things are always followed by routine. In fact, though now we are testing the complex, we are actually operating it. We prepare the same space vehicles, those of about the same class, "Soyuz," and we are launching cargo ships from the latest "TM" range nearly every month. Examining and endorsing a program is one of the main functions of the state commission. The endorsing is preceded by a prolonged discussion of a program and its correlation with all departments involved. It happens sometimes that the Academy of Sciences agrees, whereas the Health Ministry objects because its interests have not been fully observed. Therefore, working out a flight program is a very long and agonizing process. Sometimes we replace one experiment with another. We have been lucky so far, and it has not happened yet that a cargo craft has not arrived. Yes, you could knock on wood. Our cargo crafts arrive at their destination. But, I must say, that if a cargo craft fails to arrive, we always have one as a standby, capable of carrying out its task. We could not work otherwise, because, indeed, a vacuum would arise if a cargo craft fails to arrive, a vacuum in terms of the lives of the people up there and the experiments they conduct. [end recording]

Crew Named for Launch

LD200932 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 20 Dec 87

[Text] Very intense work is in progress today at the Baykonur cosmodrome on preparing the "Soyuz-TM4" spacecraft for launch. Its launch is scheduled for 1418 Moscow time tomorrow. At a session this morning, the state commission decided on the crew. Its commander is Vladimir Georgiyevich Titov, the flight engineer is Musat Khiromonovich Manarov, and the cosmonaut-researcher is Anatoliy Semenovich Levchenko. The crew will be taking over in orbit from their comrades Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov. Anatoliy Levchenko will also be returning to earth with them.

Craft Launched 21 Dec

LD211336 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—The Soviet Union launched the "Soyuz TM-4" spaceship at 14 hours 18 minutes today.

The crew includes Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov, Musa Manarov and Anatoliy Levchenko.

'Soyuz,' 'Mir' To Link Up

LD211346 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS special correspondent Aleksandr Romanov:

Hardly had the "Soyuz TM-4" spacecraft, manned by Vladimir Titov, Musa Manarov and Anatoliy Levchenko, entered orbit, when the crew received greetings from Yuriy Romanenko working on board the orbiting station "Mir" ("Peace").

"We congratulate you on successful launch," the message said. "Looking forward to meeting you on board the "Mir-Kvant" complex."

But it will take another 48 hours before the space veterans meet the newcomers who are to replace them in orbit. The link-up between the "Soyuz" and "Mir" is slated for the afternoon of December 23.

"How do the crew feel now?" the TASS correspondent asked veteran spaceman, Twice Hero of the Soviet Union Nikolay Bukavishnikov. In reply, the cosmonaut pointed at the big screen with the image of the spacecraft's interior, complete with the new crew. It seems that the cosmonauts have borne well the load on take-off," Rukavishnikov observed.

"After docking with the "Mir" station," he went on to say, "both crews will work for about one week together. Titov's crew, without discontinuing scientific experiments and checkups of the veterans, will take over the station and start independent work after the colleagues leave.

Titov and Manarov will stay on board the station, while Levchenko will return to earth along with Romanenko and Aleksandrov."

The programme of flight on board the "Mir" station, Rukavishnikov said, would include joint work with Bulgarian cosmonauts. Equipment designed in accordance with space programmes of the two countries would be brought to the "Mir" station.

Space Official Interviewed on 'Mir'

LD191231 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—The space travellers aboard the orbital complex "Mir" have carried out over 600 astrophysical and 130 geophysical sessions during the current record-setting space mission. Besides, the spacemen performed about a hundred technical experiments, close to 80 visual observation sessions in the interests of various branches of the national economy, and a series of medico-biological research efforts, Aleksey Leonov, deputy head of the cosmonauts training center named after Yuriy Gagarin, said in a TASS interview.

For instance, the cosmonauts observed with the aid of the astrophysical module "Kvant" the supernova in the galaxy of the Great Magellanic Cloud, which appeared on the night from February 23 to February 24. They conducted experiments involving the use of "Biryusa" equipment and a mirror-beam furnace. Under research were, in part, the perculiarities of melting and crystallizing miscellaneous materials in zero gravity by heating them by the concentrated radiant energy flux.

The orbital mission, the longest in the history of cosmonautics, is drawing to an end. Yuriy Romanenko, the commander of the main crew, has been staying in zero gravity for 315 days. Pilot engineer Aleksandr Aleksandrov, who replaced his colleague Aleksandr Laveykin, has been working in space for almost five months.

Aleksey Leonov took note of the especially complex nature of the current expedition. During this mission, the successful Soviet-Syrian international flight was carried out in July, 1987, the cosmonauts emerged out twice and removed malfunctions in the astrophysical module "Kvant".

Commanders Vladimir Titov and Aleksandr Volkov, Pilot Engineers Musa Manarov and Aleksandr Kaleri, Researcher Cosmonauts Anatoliy Levchenko and Aleksandr Shchukin, colleagues of the orbiting crew, are under preparations at Baykonur spaceport to carry on work in space. Certainly, one trio will fly, General Leonov concluded.

Flight of 'Progress-33' Completed
LD191701 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 19 Dec (TASS)—A TASS correspondent reports from Flight Control Center:

The flight of the "Progress-33" unmanned cargo vessel, which was put into near-earth orbit on 21 November 1987, has ended.

On 23 November, the cargo ship docked with the "Mir" manned complex. The operations planned for the period of joint flight, which included the unloading and refueling of the station's propulsion system, were carried out fully.

Today, at 1116 Moscow time, the "Progress-33" vessel separated from the "Mir" orbital complex. Then, in accordance with commands from the control center, the orientation of the ship was effected, and its propulsion system was activated. As a result of braking, the "Progress-33" went into a descent trajectory, entered the dense layers of the atmosphere, and ceased to exist.

The cosmonauts Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov in the last few days were involved in astrophysical and medico-biological research. In accordance with the preparation plan for the return to earth, they also carried out a routine training session in the pneumovacuum costume "Chibis."

Within the framework of the program for studying materials in space, experiments are continuing with the use of the apparatus "Electrotopograf." Their aim is to receive new information regarding the influence of open space on various materials. Specialists are interested in particular in the changes of the surface of the samples being studied, on account of erosion and chemical interaction with ionic components of the atmosphere.

Today, geophysical experiments, wet cleaning of the room areas of the complex, and physical exercises are planned for Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov. Time for rest has also been allocated.

At the Baykonur cosmodrome, preparation for the launch of the space ship "Soyuz TM-4" has been completed. The launch-vehicle with the ship has been set up at the launch position. Final checks of the rocket-space complex are being carried out.

The launch of the manned ship "Soyuz TM-4" is scheduled for 21 December at 1418 Moscow time.

Balebanov Interviewed on Space Cooperation
LD210029 Moscow International Service in Italian 2000 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Interview with Dr Vyacheslav Balebanov, deputy director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by unidentified announcer; date and place not given]

[Text] The Soviet space research program and international science cooperation in this area is the subject of the interview given by Dr Vyacheslav Balebanov, deputy director of the space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Begin recording] [Balebanov in Russian with superimposed Italian translation] Mankind will not remain forever on the earth. To begin with, we will penetrate timidly into the atmosphere and then will conquer the entire solar system. For the Soviet Union, these words uttered at the beginning of the century by Konstantin Tsiolkovskiy, the pioneer of astronautics, are something more than a romantic vision of the world, said Dr Balebanov. The scenarios drafted by this scientific genius have been or are today a program of action. In order to carry out such a program, the USSR is doing an extensive range of scientific research in circumterrestrial space and on the planets of the solar system.

The successes attained by Soviet astronautics are undeniable. Since the historic flight by Yuriy Gagarin in April 1961, the USSR has always maintained primacy in the field of piloted flights. At the moment, the astronauts are carrying out research on board the third generation of "Mir" orbital station. Yuriy Romanenko has established a new record for staying in space: 300 days. This period would be sufficient not only to complete a trip as far as Mars but also to complete a major portion of the return flight. During the last 6 years, most satellites placed in orbit throughout the world have been Soviet.

[Announcer] We asked Dr Balebanov: What will Soviet specialists do in the years to come?

[Balebanov] For the 30th anniversary of the launching of the first Sputnik, the Soviet specialists put together and publicized to world scientific quarters a program for the exploration of the universe to be completed by the year 2000. After the Phobos project has been concluded, this program provides for new stages of research to be carried out on Mars. In a nutshell, this is one of the planets of the solar system closest to Earth where there is a hope, small as it is, of finding some form of life or traces of (?some former) existence. As is known, the U.S. Vikings looked for traces of life on Mars but did not find any. However, experiments themselves are not in a position to provide

a definitive answer, as well as if samples of Martian soil were taken and examined accurately in our laboratories. This is precisely the way chosen by Soviet scientists.

The other research object of the Soviet program is the cosmic plasma. The survey will be done either on small orbits of hundreds of kilometers or hundreds of thousands of kilometers from earth. The satellite network will allow a stereoscopic picture to be obtained of the processes occurring in circumterrestrial space. It will also check to what extent the hypothesis is realistic that such processes precede certain phenomena in plasma which bring about the circulation of the stratosphere and probably influence the climate on our planet. The research, to be conducted in the field of extra-atmospheric astronomy, embraces virtually a complete range of electromagnetic radiation, ranging from radio waves to gamma rays. For this purpose, a new generation of astronomic observatories are being created. They will allow the study of some rather violent and luminous phenomena in the universe, occurring at temperatures of millions of degrees. The new observatories will also allow insight to be gained into more remote epochs of the development of the universe and will also allow an understanding of the processes governing the world of the stars and of the gallaxies. Soviet scientists attach great importance, especially for our future, to research carried out in space.

[Announcer] You are listening to the interview with the deputy director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Dr Vyacheslav Balebanov.

[Balebanov] On the other hand, space science produces and continues to produce increasingly major results. Further development of telecommunications, the meteorological network, and other innovations of astronautics also applied to satisfying man's many requirements are a testimony of these results. In the years to come, space laboratories will be designed for the construction of materials with specific properties which cannot be manufactured in terrestrial conditions. Positive results have already been attained in this sector, and the materials that have been obtained have found practical use. The Soviet space exploration program, its constancy and coherence, attract the interest of world scientific circuits. In the view of many foreign foreign scientists, the strength of the USSR consists in its methodical approach, in the wide range and variety of tasks set by the scientific study of space, and in the use in daily life of what has been attained.

[Announcer] What, we asked Dr Balebanov, in your view, are the fundamental aspects of the U.S. program?

[Balebanov] U.S. astronautics, however, is developing along a different road. One of it biggest successes was to bring a man down on the moon, but soon after the completion of this program, U.S. scientists asked themselves the question of what to do afterwards. The Shuttle project is the result of a compromise between two opposing requirements, and as such it has failed to produce practical results in any area. Neither economic forecasts nor the hope of industrial potential in space have been vindicated. There was then the Challenger explosion, involving a seven-man crew. For over 1 and 1/2 years, no shuttle space ship has been launched into space, and this will not happen in the course of the next year, either.

About a dozen space [word indistinct] which have been around ready for quite some time and equipped with exceptional scientific instruments cannot be launched because of the shortage of carrier rockets, while the U.S. scientists see their hopes going up in smoke. They stress with bitterness that it was a big historic error to give prominence to the Shuttle program. At the moment, the United States is hurriedly rebuilding the carrier rocket macrostructure. The USSR has offered to launch U.S. satellites with its own carrier rockets, but the U.S. Administration, under the pretext of protecting its technology, has vetoed launches of this type.

According to the opinion of Soviet scientists, and by most scientists abroad, insurmountable political and ideological barriers and contradictions incapable of being resolved for fruitful cooperation among various countries in the field of astronautics do not exist. Today it is very important not only to maintain a climate of international scientific cooperation; it has to be developed further because this would allow global problems to be resolved, problems which the whole of mankind has to face both in space and on earth. This is what the efforts of Soviet scientists are aiming at. Humanity has finally realized that it is part of our planet and cannot, does not, have the right to regard the environment as something external, something that does not have to be cared for.

Today's man's activity on earth—especially intensive industrial development—has already caused considerable ecological problems. One of these, to give an example, is the erosion of the earth's climate. What this amount[illegible]o is a mutation of the processes of change between the surface of the planet, the oceans, and the atmosphere. These processes have been established over hundreds of millions of years during the evolution of the planet and of its biosphere.

Space technology could exercise a constant control over the processes of environmental deterioration and allow reliable forecasts to be made on the nature of the risks toward which the earth and the atmosphere will move in the future. This technology could counsel the necessary measures to preserve normal living conditions on our planet. Only those who have well-defined plans to make use of space for military purposes are not keen on international cooperation. Space must remain peaceful not only to preserve and amplify the favorable conditions for scientific research, but also to safeguard life on our planet. [end recording]

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.